X-82110

Catholic Ideals in Social Life

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/catholicidealsin00cuthiala

Catholic Ideals
in
Social Life

By
FATHER CUTHBERT
O.S.F.C.

R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD.
1, 2 & 4 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
AND AT MANCHESTER, BIRMINGHAM, & GLASGOW
BENZIGER BROS.: NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
1911
[*All rights reserved*]

Nihil Obstat
F. GULIELMUS, *O.S.F.C.*
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur
F. ANSELMUS, *O.S.F.C.*
Min. Prov. Angliæ.

Imprimatur
✠ FRANCISCUS *Archiep. Westmonast.*

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

Several of the papers in this volume—"St Francis and You," "The Working-man's Apostolate," "The Priest and Social Reform" and "The Idea of Responsibility"—have already appeared as pamphlets or as articles in magazines. I have to thank the Editors of the "Catholic World," the "Tablet" and the "Weekly Register" for their kind permission to reprint these articles.

Throughout these papers the reader will perceive a unity of thought and purpose. My desire has been to give expression to the Catholic mind touching some of the most urgent questions of the hour in regard to social life and conduct. I have written not for the student or specialist, but for the ordinary intelligent wayfarer whom these questions concern.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Crawley, March 12, 1904.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.

DEAR F. CUTHBERT.—I am very glad to learn that the first edition of your book "Catholic Ideals in Social Life" is already exhausted and that many copies of the second edition will be sold as soon as it appears. Social problems are not less urgent or nearer settlement in our midst than they are elsewhere, and Catholics in England must face these questions and give all the aid they can in finding a satisfactory answer to them.

You have endeavoured to find in Catholic tradition and in the teaching of the Supreme Rulers of the Catholic Church the solution of many of the difficulties which confront all those who feel interest in these matters and who are striving to heal the social evils of the day. Under your guidance Catholics are able to gauge the extent, and to learn the remedies, of these evils.

May your book have a wide circulation and awaken among us a hearty desire in all classes of society to face and to overcome the perils which surround us, by a firm adherence to the teaching of the Gospel both in public and in private life.

Believe me, dear F. Cuthbert,
Your devoted servant in Christ,

✠ FRANCIS,

January 15, 1905. *Archbishop of Westminster.*

CONTENTS

PART I

	PAGE
The Church and Personal Liberty . . .	1
The Christian State	22
The Education of Woman	42
Marriage	59
The Value of Work	74
The Priest and Social Reform	88
The Responsibility of Wealth	99
The Idea of Responsibility	116

PART II

Religious Aspects of Social Work	127
The Working-man's Apostolate:	
i *The Catholic Working-man a Missioner*	152
ij *Conditions essential to the Working-man's Apostolate*	160
iij *Duties of the Catholic Working-man at the Present Time* . . .	168
St Francis and You:	
i *The Franciscan Vocation* . . .	195
ij *The Three Radical Evils in Society at the Present Day*	209
iij *The Need of Personal Service* .	233

Part I

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN SOCIAL LIFE

The Church and Personal Liberty

THE old things have gone and the new are before us. At every moment in our existence, once we have passed the initial stage, is this saying true. Whilst we live we can never rest in what we have achieved, but every step gained is but an indication of further progress. "To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often"; and that is true of all life, intellectual, social and political. In our time the change has been of so radical a character as to justify us in regarding the period as one of the most momentous in the history of Christian civilization. For several centuries Christendom has been undergoing a process of disintegration. The system built up by patient and heroic toil during the long mediæval period has slowly and violently been shivered and broken up. To-day but little of it remains; but out of the

destruction has sprung a new order of things. We can see now more distinctly than those who were engulfed in the maze of the transition, whither we are tending; and out of the contradictions and violences of their struggle we perceive a new system emerging, having a shapely form of its own and imperative in its demand upon our allegiance. Call it what you will—democracy or constitutionalism or any name you like—the thing itself is here and will remain, permeating our whole social life. And the more frankly we recognize the fact the better it will be for us. We cannot go back upon the past, but we can, if we are wise, take our part in shaping the future. And this is manifestly the duty of all Catholics according to the measure of their opportunity.

For the Church is bound to no particular secular system or method. It matters not to her whether dynasties flourish or republics, whether the established policy be feudal or constitutional, whether men work by competition or co-operation. All these things belong to the temporal order of the world and are incidents in secular development. In themselves they represent the working out of the divine order of the world in its merely temporal aspect. But the Church has to do directly with the spiritual and eternal, and if she intervenes

at all in temporal affairs, it can only be to secure the eternal truths which are often so intimately bound up with temporal development. It does not belong to her to determine the course of this development: that runs by a law of its own, which too is divine in its origin, inasmuch as God is the author of nature. This law the Church must recognize and co-operate with. She may neither hurry it forward nor hold it back: she may but accept it as it comes. *

Throughout all secular changes her one object is to make manifest to men the personality of Jesus Christ as the vivifying source of moral and spiritual life; and to insist that under all circumstances His teaching shall be maintained. But the Gospel in no wise contravenes the law of secular development: it only secures that this development shall run in harmony with the highest spiritual life, revealed in the personality of our Lord. The work of the Church is to enforce and maintain this harmony; and this she does by keeping clearly before the world the

* It has always seemed to me that the policy of the late Pope Leo XIII in regard to the French Republic was a heroic assertion of this principie. Whatever may be the immediate results of that policy from a political standpoint, it emphasized the independence of the Church from any particular secular system, and thus had world-wide significance.

true mind of Jesus Christ, which is contained in that divine tradition handed down inviolate through all Christian ages.

But this divine tradition, in so far as it finds expression in words and institutions, has necessarily to be clothed in forms and language borrowed from secular life. The idea of Church authority, for example, of necessity took to itself legal forms borrowed from secular governments; the language of theology has been taken from secular philosophies; and in the formation of social life generally the Church has taken the social conventions and methods of the world and adapted them to her purpose. In the ecclesiastical legislation of the middle ages, the feudal system was taken for granted, even when the Church was making laws to correct its evils. Serfdom was recognized though the action of the Church always tended to humanize the serf's condition. And how largely religious Orders and Confraternities have been shaped by the conventions of mediæval society!

Now it is no part of the mission of the Church to maintain and perpetuate these social forms and conventions: she does but make use of them at the time to express her mind to the generation for which she legislates. But it not infrequently happens that because these conventions are found

to have been accepted in ecclesiastical legislation and institutions at some past time, the Church is therefore supposed to be irrevocably allied to them. It is hard to convince some Catholics that the cause of a dynasty is not bound up with Catholicism, or that Anglo-Saxon methods of government are compatible with the Catholic idea of authority, simply because for centuries the Church has had to deal with dynasties, and has not found it wise or needful to adopt Anglo-Saxon methods. Some centuries hence, when Catholic life has come to be formulated more in accordance with the democratic spirit of to-day, a new phase of secular development may occur in which the democratic trait may be less prominent; and then there will be Catholics who will find it hard to reconcile the new development with the democratic character of the then existing laws and conventions. So very difficult is it for the ordinary mind to disentangle an idea from its temporal embodiment. Thus it is that Catholic tradition is often confounded with mere transient forms and systems with which from necessity it has had to ally itself in times past. We often hear liberal violence upbraided as subversive of social life; and justly so. For no individual has any right to set himself up as arbiter of the destiny

of the Church, and dictate a line of action in violent opposition to those who govern the Church. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that conservative prejudice may embarrass the freedom of the Church equally as much as revolutionary violence. And at no time has there been greater need to keep one's mind free from prejudice and short views than at this present time.

Now the most radical feature in the situation which confronts the Church today is the growing predominance of the Anglo-Saxon spirit in the political and social life of the civilized world. By the Anglo-Saxon spirit I mean that enthusiasm for personal liberty and individual initiative which from the beginning has been the moulding principle of English life, but which now has found an entrance into the aspiration of other races. Born and nurtured in the atmosphere of this enthusiasm, the Anglo-Saxon race may rightfully claim it as especially their own. With them it has been the chief passion of their life, separating them as a people from the peoples around them, and forming them first into a nation, and then into an empire. But now this spirit is no longer confined to its native home. It has seized upon the Latin races, hitherto ruled by an idea and enthusiasm the very anti-

thesis of the Anglo-Saxon. In its endeavour to find a lodgement amongst the Latin nations, the spirit of personal liberty has so far not been altogether conducive either to their peace or dignity. Slightly understood even by its Latin votaries, the Anglo-Saxon idea has had to battle with prejudices and habits formed by centuries of absolutism, and one can well understand how a conservative Latin observer, knowing this spirit of liberty only as it is presented in the immature enthusiasm of his own race, will look upon it as a moral fever, to be treated as a disease. Only when it is observed in the life of the people it has formed, can a just estimate be had of its true nature, and of that tenacity of purpose which will yet modify the life of the nations amongst whom it is finding a welcome. It can never be to them what it has been to the English-speaking race, the supreme factor in political and social life; nor mould their character with the same completeness with which it has moulded ours. Nations cannot take to themselves altogether new characters. Nevertheless, the personal liberty of the Anglo-Saxon has become an ideal in their lives, to be reckoned with by Church and State.

There are those even amongst ourselves who are apt to look upon this spirit

of liberty as an utterly evil thing, and who regard an alliance between it and Catholicism as wholly impossible. Some have gone so far as to say that the English-speaking peoples can only become Catholic when they renounce their birthright; as though any nation yet has had to renounce its national character at its baptism! Such extremists are fortunately few. Many, however, there are, vaguely suspicious and distrustful.

Such a spirit of distrust is not only mischievous beyond measure to the cause of the Church, but is opposed to the very genius of Catholicism, which hitherto has shown itself capable of assimilating the characteristics and tempers of all peoples and nations, and has not been afraid to claim all these things as her own. This does not mean that the Church, in assimilating national traits and policies, has not to correct excesses or remedy defects to which a national or racial spirit may be prone. But it does mean that the way of the Church in dealing with the people is to take to herself their dominant ideals and their characteristic methods, supplying for their limitations out of the greater fulness of her own life. And in the immediate future we may confidently expect that the Church, brought intimately into contact with the spirit of personal liberty,

whether amongst the English-speaking peoples or the Latin, will ally herself with that spirit in working for the salvation of the nations.

Much indeed of the opposition which is raised against the Anglo-Saxon idea of personal liberty is due to a misconception of its purpose and nature. It is regarded in the first place as inimical to authority: and that in spite of the fact that of all peoples the English and American are the most law-abiding and the most loyal to authority. An objection to this statement may perhaps be found in the anarchical condition of the Anglican church. But in this instance the anarchy arises from the fact that there is no definite authority in the Anglican Church to be loyal to: it is a communion without a head, and suffers accordingly. This religious anarchy, however, is but a transient phenomenon in the life of the English nation. In the political and social life of the English-speaking peoples, where authority is well defined, the principle of personal liberty goes hand in hand with a deep personal reverence for the sanctity of the law.

Amongst people accustomed to absolutism liberty is usually conceived of as license; and to be free is to be without restraint. They are so accustomed to regard external positive law as the rule of

morals as to lose a proper appreciation of the restraining influence of personal convictions and of honour. With a free people, on the other hand, liberty begets a sense of personal responsibility in which lies the best security for the law.

According to the best tradition of Anglo-Saxon life, liberty might be defined as the right of every man to the possession and realization of himself as a rational being. It implies that every man has a natural right to live his own life, and that this right is inherent in his very being, prior to any sanction on the part of the community. But no man can properly realize himself apart from his fellowmen, and hence arises the natural necessity of society and the State. The State, therefore, has its origin in the right of the individual to self-realization as a rational being, and it exists primarily to secure to all its members the exercise of this right. For this purpose it is endowed with authority to repress individual violence and to guard and foster the common interests. What, however, we must particularly notice about the Anglo-Saxon conception of the State and of authority is that the true Englishman will never submit to be held in bondage by a social body with which he is in fundamental disagreement; for to do so would be to surrender that personal liberty

which is the first article of his social creed. Yet convince him that his interests are fundamentally one with the society or party which claims his allegiance, and no more loyal subject can be found, nor one more ready to sacrifice smaller personal interests to the common good. The pivot of his allegiance is a personal conviction that the society represents a fundamental common interest between himself and his fellowmen. Whilst that conviction lasts he is unalterably loyal: when that conviction is wanting, he holds apart in honest isolation. To retain his allegiance, therefore, it is necessary to convince him that the fundamental interests binding him to his party or the State are being maintained: for to him authority exists only to maintain these common interests, and when it ceases to maintain these, authority itself no longer exists.

It is at this point that the Anglo-Saxon spirit differs so radically from that which has been fostered during the past four or five centuries in the Latin nations. The system prevalent in these nations has tended to divorce obedience from a personal conviction of the common good, and to secure authority, not by the reasonable assent of the subjects, but by coercion.

Now there are cases in which obedience by coercion is necessary for the

common welfare. It is frequently necessary in times of great popular excitement or of revolutionary violence, when the people are incapable of reasonable thought. But as a normal condition of affairs it is manifestly unworthy of human society. In ordinary life it is much better that obedience should proceed from a harmony of mind between those in authority and the subjects who are required to obey. But such harmony is possible only when the two parties take each other into mutual confidence, and in this the wisdom of the English-speaking race has shown itself. Whilst the Latin governments have been ruling on the principle of military discipline, the Anglo-Saxon have recognized the principle that the people as citizens of the State are co-partners in the working of the State, to be convinced of the necessity or utility of the law before the law is made. Doubtless the system has its defects. Many a good law has had to wait for years before taking its place on the statute-book, because it was not properly understood by the people. Many a good work has been left undone because the people were not convinced of its utility. Yet on the whole the system has worked well; and though a good law or a good work has been delayed, yet once it has won the people's allegiance,

it acquires a stability and influence impossible to enactments or institutions built up by penalties or against the popular will.

But it may be objected that this idea of popular liberty is at variance with the divinely appointed authority which governs the Church, and can never be recognized in the dealings of the Church with the people. The Church, it will be urged, depends for her authority not on the will of the people but upon the commission of Jesus Christ. This objection, were it not so frequently urged by the votaries of another system, need hardly be seriously considered. For we are not concerned here with the principle of authority but rather with its method. The Anglo-Saxon spirit absorbed into Catholicism will necessarily acknowledge that the source of the Church's authority is the commission of Jesus Christ; nor does this idea of personal liberty in any way derogate from the absolute prerogatives of the Holy See and the bishops as pastors of the Church. But it will undoubtedly affect the methods whereby the ordinary discipline of the Church is maintained, and still more will it affect individual and social action amongst Catholics on the thousand and one questions which lie outside the ordinary

sphere of ecclesiastical legislation, in regard to domestic, social or political life. It will, in a word, affect our general notions of the ordinary relations between the individual and the community, and in many ways alter the point of view to which Catholics have largely grown accustomed during the past four centuries.

For owing to the peculiar circumstances of the time, the social and political life of Catholicism has been almost entirely shaped by the system and methods of the Latin nations. The great schism forced the Church into a close alliance with the nations, and to preserve her authority in the face of the revolutionary spirit of the north, she had perforce to seek protection in the assertion of the uttermost prerogatives of authority. The temper and the methods of the Latin peoples helped her to do this; and thus it came about that the Church has seemed to be in antagonism towards the spirit and methods of the English race. But if we go back beyond the period of storm and stress, and study the political and social life of Catholicism in its more normal attitude in the middle ages, we shall find a singular regard for personal liberty. As illustrative of the normal Catholic policy we may take an instance where least one might expect to find it. In the rule given by St Bene-

dict to his monks it is laid down that on all matters seriously affecting the welfare of the community, the abbot shall not act without consulting the whole body of monks, even to the youngest novice. A later asceticism would have denied the monks any voice in the government of the community. Not so, however, with St Benedict, in whom the Catholic instinct of the middle ages recognized a model law-giver. And hence in the history of the Benedictine Order one finds a spirit of personal liberty ever blending with a most perfect system of authority. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries again this same individualism is even more strongly marked. The democratic awakening of that period, manifested in the rise of the commercial towns, is also prominent in the spirit of the new Orders of friars and in the intellectual revival. Where does one find more fearless speculation and bold originality of thought than in the early scholastic period? Where greater liberty of spirit than in the devotional literature of that time? And what a rush of personal initiative we find in the whole ecclesiastical life of those days!

With this period of the Church the spirit of the present does indeed find itself in deep sympathy; and if the new spirit of our own time must needs justify

itself by historic precedent, it has but to point to those "Ages of Faith": there it will find sufficient justification. And for this reason we may say that the spirit of personal liberty is far more in accordance with the normal Catholic instinct than is the spirit of absolutism, and that, in returning to a more normal and constructive condition of existence, the Church will naturally ally itself with the spirit of personal liberty.

Perhaps one of the most difficult notions to eradicate from the mind of Catholics is the notion that the Church is on its defence against universal anarchy and revolt. This notion has become so ingrained that the ordinary Catholic is apt to see in every new development of secular life a conscious attack on Catholic teaching and sentiment. Whereas it is much more true to say that the world is more or less indifferent to Catholic claims, and pursues its course, not with any strict thought of Catholicism, but with the immediate desire of satisfying its own thirst for life: it is more or less by accident that it opposes itself to Catholicism, since it has come to regard the Church as out of touch with the thought and life of the modern world. It is no longer anti-Catholic of set purpose, but because the Church is held to have no part in modern life save as a drag upon its progress and

an upholder of the dead past. The attitude of mind of the world at the present day towards the Church is thus radically different from that which guided the world's policy down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Modern secular development is indifferent to the Church rather than hostile; and it is indifferent because it expects no help from the Church in the building up of its life. Much the same phenomenon is apparent in the history of the early thirteenth century, before the new Orders of friars succeeded in reconciling the democratic spirit of the time with the Church; only perhaps the breach between the Church and the new spirit to-day is wider than it was then. The significance of the present situation therefore is that the Church is no longer a besieged city. The beleaguering forces have drawn off, so far as the main body of secular development is concerned, and are pursuing a course apart from the Church. But the Church, by the law of our divine commission, cannot let the world thus pass by. Her duty is to follow the world up, and out of its secular achievements construct the kingdom of God. Thus the situation to-day is radically different from that of the past four centuries. Then the problem was for the Church to maintain intact her own sovereign authority; now

it is to reconstruct her social and political life, and make good the ravages incidental to a state of war. But this reconstruction can only take place upon the lines demanded by the needs and ideals of the present age: in this way only can the world be reconciled and the modern peoples made into good subjects. Reconciliation is now the watchword of the Church's policy, as formerly the watchword was Defence.

Enough, however, has been said to justify the position of those who believe in the ultimate alliance of Catholicism with the ideals and methods of the English-speaking race, and who see in the present situation of the Church a demand for a fuller recognition amongst Catholics of that ideal of personal liberty which, identified by history with the Anglo-Saxon, is now becoming the property of the younger generation in the Latin nations. The hard and fast adherents of absolutism will, of course, never be convinced; to them personal liberty will spell license to the end of their term. But it is well for those to whom the spirit of liberty is as the breath of life to keep faith in their own ideal, and work to bring about its incorporation into the visible life of the Church. In doing this they will assuredly be doing a service to the Catholic cause; for only as this comes to

pass will the Church regain the sympathy of the multitude and Catholicism become again, as in the "Ages of Faith," synonymous with the highest human developments, whether in secular or religious life.

At present the greatest weakness of Catholicism is undoubtedly a lack of enthusiasm, due to a mistaken and inordinate repression of personal initiative under the absolutist system of the Latin nations. This system has tended to reduce all activity to specialized forms, and to repress whatever activity lies outside these forms. It has tended to reduce everything to rule, and to set measures beyond which human endeavour shall not pass. The consequence to-day is that our organizations and associations lack buoyancy; they have become rigid from over-systematizing and over-formulating, and are incapable of meeting the new demands upon them. Instead of assisting and fostering personal effort, they tend to encage it; and thus in too many instances the spirit has drooped and become inert. In the effort to control individualism they have stamped out individuality, and destroyed the enthusiasm which leads to success.

The influence of the English-speaking race will, it is to be hoped, revive in the

Church the spirit of personal initiative. To this spirit we look for that yet wider development of Catholic life, which the world now needs after the distractions and disruptions of the past four centuries. But in incorporating this spirit of initiative into her social life and institutions the Church will naturally stimulate the sense of personal responsibility, which is the surest corrective of those defects to which the English spirit is inclined. Under the Latin system responsibility for the common welfare is too much relegated to those who administer the government of the community; nor could it be otherwise. Where there is no freedom of initiative there can be no intimate sense of responsibility. Under a system of greater personal liberty the development of a sense of personal responsibility for the general welfare becomes imperative: in this chiefly lies the security of the social bond under all systems. No government can long be stable which is not supported by the popular conscience; no community can flourish and give forth the best human results in which the majority of the people are but as pawns on a chessboard. And this is true of religious associations even more than of secular: it is peculiarly true at this present time. The spirit of liberty is abroad and it can-

not be repressed; but it can be taken into the service of religion—as it was in times bygone—and from an enemy converted into a friend. And this is what the Church of the immediate future will do; and in doing, save humanity and justify herself.

The Christian State

Among the religious problems of the hour, one of the most ominous is the general tendency amongst the nations to secularize the State. It is difficult to say exactly how far this tendency is due to a materialist temper of mind with its worship of the merely visible and temporal, and how far it is a symptom of the popular discontent which demands a readjustment of the relations between Church and State in the general reconstruction of political and social life. Undoubtedly much of the anti-clerical temper is directed not so much against religion itself as against the existing conventions under which the Church secures her rights and privileges. Everywhere there seems to be a widespread feeling amongst the people that the Church represents a party in the State rather than the people at large; that she is allied with certain vested interests rather than with the common welfare. And until this popular discontent is allayed the anti-clerical propaganda will find support, if not in the active sympathy of the multitude, at least in their apathy. Anti-clericalism is, in fact,

the temper of the hour amongst large masses of the people both at home and abroad, and it will increase and flourish until the mass of the people is persuaded that the influence of the Church is exerted for the general good, that the Church is the guardian of popular liberty and that her action in the State is for the benefit of the people themselves. The Church, said Cardinal Manning, has no longer to deal with dynasties but with the people; and that is true in a deeper sense than appears on the surface. Whether rightly or falsely, the Church has come to be regarded as having interests apart from the multitude, and so far she has got out of touch with the people. To remedy this unfortunate condition of things, to win back the people's confidence and regain her own liberty of unfettered intercourse with the people, is now one of her most urgent needs. How this is to be brought about only the future can show; amongst the English-speaking peoples fortunately the Church is free, and this is the reason why it would seem that the strength of the Church in the immediate future lies, not in the nominally Catholic States, but amongst the free peoples of the North. Of the utmost importance is it then that in these countries the rights of the Church should be secured not by concordats or other legal

alliance with the State but by the people themselves making use of their civic rights. With the people, not with governments, lies the strength of the Church to-day.

It is the more needful that the Catholics in England and America should keep free of any embarrassing alliance with the State, which might tend to put the people out of sympathy with the Church, since in the near future the question whether secularism or Christianity is to determine the religious character of the nation will undoubtedly depend upon the position which the Catholic Church will secure in the estimation of the country. We have come to a point in the people's life when their religious destiny is again being put into the hands of Catholics. The present alliance in England between nonconformity and secularism in the agitation over education is hastening on the moment when the English people will have to decide whether the nation shall be avowedly Christian or secularist. The nonconformists to-day demand the secularization of education; if they gain their end, to-morrow their free-thinking allies will demand the entire dechristianizing of all State policy and legislation. Nor can Anglicanism effectively stop the flood-tide which is setting in: its very legal position as the Established

Church handicaps its freedom and effectiveness at this crisis, even more than the concordat fetters the Catholic Church abroad. Moreover Anglicanism is a house divided against itself, hardly knowing from one day to another its own mind, but constantly swaying between Catholic and erastian principles. Against the consistent policy of the nonconformist and secularist alliance the Catholic Church alone can oppose a policy, equally consistent and uncompromising; and the future lies between them.

But it must be well understood that the cleavage between secularist and Catholic to-day is on no question of detail in national policy: it goes deeper down into the fundamental principles upon which the nation's life is built. It is the most radical of all differences; a matter of an entire State policy. And unless this fact is clearly understood we shall be apt to play into the enemy's hands—as Catholics have often done before—and perhaps after a temporary triumph, find ourselves in a false position. Not for any apparent advantage, however inviting, may we betray these fundamental principles upon which the security of the Christian life depends. It will be well then to understand clearly what are the principles which lie at the basis of the Catholic conception of the

State. They can perhaps best be explained by a series of propositions.

Our first proposition is—*that the State is not the absolute master of the individual;* that in fact it has no rights at all over the individual, except what the welfare of the individual in his personal and social relations gives to the state. The individual citizen has a right to exist prior to that of the state; and he forfeits this right only when he ceases to live as a reasonable being should. Only when a man abuses his liberty to the injury of his fellow-man has the state any right to restrict his liberty or to interfere with his action. But as long as the individual in no way injures his fellow-man or himself, he is free to do as he wills. And if the State does interfere without necessity and in violation of that natural freedom which belongs to every human being, then the individual has natural rights to resist. Nay, not only has he a right to resist, but in some cases he has a duty, whenever by submission to State interference he would betray the cause of God or the rights of his fellow-men.

This principle may be said to be the most fundamental in the constitution of States according to Catholic teaching. Often has it been said that the Church is opposed to the cause of liberty; and

with sorrow be it acknowledged, too often have Catholic princes and politicians, forgetting their Catholic principles, acted in violation of that essential individual liberty which the highest Catholic teaching has ever proclaimed; indeed it is with shame that we see the sacred principle of personal liberty so generally violated in the so-called Catholic countries.

But we must remember that these countries, Catholic in name though they be, have for centuries been under the influence of that pagan statecraft, which was brought in at the Renaissance, and has since done its best to enslave both the people and the Church. It is one of the blessings for which in the light of events, English-speaking Catholics may thank God, that for nearly four centuries they were cut off from participation in the iniquity wrought by unchristian statecraft: we have at least this advantage that we can appeal to our Catholic principles to-day without having to blush for a participation in the tyrannies of the past. To us therefore is it given as a peculiar right to uphold this Catholic doctrine of personal liberty as a fundamental principle of Christian statecraft against all who would violate it, be they the free-thinking politicians of the continent, or the secularist politicians of our

own country, or those even amongst ourselves who for the sake of some temporary advantage to the Church would betray those fundamental principles upon which alone the Christian State can rest. We can never consistently with Catholic principle admit State Absolutism. The State exists for the citizen, not the citizen for the State. This does not mean that the citizen is not bound in certain circumstances to sacrifice himself for the common good of the community. But it does mean that the State, as an impersonal idea and apart from the common good, has no right to interfere with personal liberty.

Our second proposition is: *That the sovereignity of the State is limited, not only by the rights of personal liberty, but also by the inherent sovereignty of the Church and the Family.* It is Catholic teaching that in all matters affecting man's spiritual and eternal welfare the authority of the Church is supreme. In these matters the State has no right to rule or determine. To the Church alone it belongs to decide what belongs to, and is consonant with, Christian faith; and to her alone it belongs in a supreme degree and for final appeal, to safeguard the sanctity of Christian life. In this sphere of life the State is subordinate to the Church, and at most has

the right to support the ruling of the Church.

Again, the Family has certain inalienable rights apart from the State. It is a parent's natural right to wield authority over his child until the child is capable of governing himself; it belongs primarily to the parent to educate the child, and parents have always a claim upon the child for support in case of need. These rights are inalienable, and the State acts outside its sphere of authority when it deprives the Family of its rights. Catholic teaching, therefore, holds that in the governance of society there are three sovereignties: the Church, the State and the Family—each independent within its own proper sphere, though oftentimes overlapping each other in the subject of their authority. Thus, for example, in the education of a child, the State rightly claims to supervise the education in so far as to see that the child shall be properly fitted to exercise the duties of citizenship. The Church, on the other hand, has the right to demand that the child's education, whilst fitting him for citizenship, shall also fit him to be a worthy member of the Church, for it belongs to the Church to guard and foster the religious development of the child. At the same time the right to educate the child

belongs primarily to the parent, and as long as the parent satisfies the rightful demands of the Church and the State he has the right to educate the child as he deems best for the child's welfare.

Marriage, again, is an example of overlapping jurisdiction. The State has the right to affix certain conditions to the marriage contract, and may lawfully punish an infringement of these conditions by a loss of civic rights. Yet the supreme jurisdiction over the marriage vow belongs not to the State, but to the Church, since marriage is a sacrament. And only the Church can legislate regarding the *validity* of marriage.

Now we Catholics are bound to uphold in all their integrity the rights of the Church and of the Family; nor can we in conscience surrender these rights to the State. On this point we are for ever opposed to all those who would make the State the one supreme authority in society—whether they be Protestants of the type who believe the Church to be a mere department of the State, or the Socialist who denies any independent rights to either Church or Family; or whether they be those who, admitting all rights in theory, in practice deny them according to the policy of the moment. Undoubtedly it is sometimes difficult to ad-

just exactly the rightful the claims of Church, the State and the Family, where these claims fall upon the same subject; and the solution is for wise and prudent statesmanship. To a case in point. In England one of the claims of the Church is to have the actual guardianship of the neglected children of the Catholic poor and of poor Catholic orphans, and to place them in Catholic institutions, whilst at the same time claiming State aid for their support. Here we have a statesmanlike solution of what to some is a knotty problem. For when a parent neglects a child or ceases to be able to provide for it, the parental right falls to the State, so far as the child's temporal welfare is concerned, but to the Church in regard to its spiritual welfare. To bring up the child in a Protestant or non-Catholic institution is oftentimes to expose the child's faith to grave injury, and in any case is a hindrance to the free exercise of the discretion claimed by the Church in fostering the child's spiritual development. To secure then her own rights the Church assumes part of the proper responsibility of the State in providing for the temporal welfare of the child. The ecclesiastical authorities provide institutions and schools, accepting from the State less than the cost of the child's temporal support. In strict justice

the State should provide the entire cost of the child's livelihood, whilst leaving the Church free to direct its spiritual education. On the other hand the State might lawfully claim exclusive guardianship of the child's temporal interests, did it in no way interfere with the rights of the Church over the child's soul. A practical compromise is the existing system. The State cedes part of its right to the Church; whilst the Church assumes part of the responsibility of the State, in order to secure the child's spiritual welfare as well as its temporal. For of course the Church can never surrender the spiritual interests for the sake of the temporal, since the spiritual are of infinitely greater value. And in this sense it is that the claim of the Church upon a citizen is superior to that of the State; whenever spiritual interests are at stake they demand prior consideration to the merely temporal.

Keeping these limitations of State authority in view we come to our third proposition, which is: *That the State's first duty is to see that every man is let live who has not forfeited his right to live.*

At first this may seem a simple truism, but let us look back at the past and see whether the State has fulfilled this clear, simple duty. Has the State in the past endeavoured to secure to every citizen

his right to live? The back streets and byways of our English towns and the starved, stunted mass of humanity which drags out its earthly existence there, give no uncertain answer.

Those slums and that large demoralized multitude are the results in large measure of centuries of legislation, of which the aim has been not to secure to every man his right to live, but to ground down one class of citizen for the benefit of other classes; it is the result of the policy of the State to side with the strong against the weak, with the rich against the poor. We have now entered upon a happier era of State policy. To-day all parties have come in a measure to recognize the injustice of mere class legislation. But the promise to reform is still often larger than the fulfilment. So far as the nation is aroused to a sense of its responsibility to its weaker citizens, it is in the right way; and our simple duty as Catholics is to throw all our energy into sustaining the nation in the better way in which it has begun to walk. But when we speak of the right to live, we mean the right to live a proper human life. To every man the State owes it to secure that he shall have reasonable opportunity to live according to his highest moral and human standard, and that the laws be framed

so as to support him in his endeavour. Hence the duty of the State to secure better housing of the poor; to restrict the power of the publican to tempt the weak to their ruin; to prevent the speculator from manipulating the markets in a way to put the price of food or clothing beyond the working-man's means. Our policy as Catholics is to favour and secure such legislation as will foster and bring about more human conditions of life for those whom the selfishness of money or power has hitherto debased.

But here, perhaps, it may be well to remark that, whilst it is a duty to foster legislation which will give even the poorest and weakest the opportunity to live a proper human life, nevertheless we must not fall into the error of making the poor altogether dependent on State-aid for their betterment. There can be no real improvement in the condition of the people which is not in some measure the result of their own effort. The State cannot make a man. In the final resort a man must make himself. Hence the policy of wise legislation is to foster self-help and not to take away the need of initiative and effort. Our aim should be to make men and not mere puppets of the State.

Very grave therefore is the mischief done by instilling into the minds of the

weak and unfortunate the notion that the State can do everything. No, when the State has done its best, self-help and personal endeavour are still necessary for the building up of a human life.

Nevertheless in the first instance it is frequently useless talking to men about self-help whilst they are bound hand and foot by conditions of life which render self-help morally impossible and kill all hope. It is vain to demand of men that they lead self-respecting lives whilst landlords exact exorbitant rents for mere garrets and hovels: and it is mere mockery to talk of thrift to a man who is unable to obtain a life-supporting wage.

How far it is wise to permit State interference in social economics is a question that will at all times exercise the minds of practical workers. To protect the weak against the selfishness of the strong, and at the same time to foster self-reliance and initiative, is a problem depending for its solution upon the wisdom of the moment. There will always be, however, people whose sympathies lean to one side of the problem, and others whose sympathies incline to the other side.

All will agree upon the necessity of the State taking the initiative in bettering a man's condition when he has sunk so low as to have no moral incentive

within himself to seek self-betterment, or when he has lost the very sense of betterment, as is so largely the case in our town-slums. The difficulty arises later when a man has been aroused to a desire of better things and put in the way of attaining to them. Then how far he is to be assisted by the State and how far left to his own exertion is a subject of practical judgement concerning which there will be diversity of opinions. Yet it is a far advance towards social justice when men recognize that the State has a duty to the weak in their efforts to better themselves.

We come now to our fourth proposition, and it is this: *A State is Christian only when in its laws and general policy it co-operates with the Church in maintaining religion and the sanctity of human life as demanded by the Christian consciousness.* The notion that life can be absolutely separated into a secular interest and a religious, is entirely opposed to the Catholic idea. Catholicism does not admit one interest on Sundays and another, altogether distinct, on week-days. Life is one, and the secular and religious interests intimately commingle. Consequently the notion that the State has nothing to do with religion but only with man's temporal concerns is from the Catholic point of

view untenable. The State necessarily either supports Christianity or discourages it: the Gospel and secularism are essentially contradictory of each other; if you support the one, you deny the other. The State therefore cannot be neutral; either it is Christian in its policy, or anti-Christian. For Christianity is not a detail of life; it is a spirit animating the whole being of man and directing his whole life.

Hence, though the direct concern of the State is with the secular interests of its citizens, still indirectly it must either make for religion or against it. If in its laws it fosters an ideal of life opposed to the Catholic consciousness—if it opens the way to neo-paganism or naturalism, it renounces its claim to be considered a Christian State.

The question now arises, how far may Catholics tolerate anti-Christian legislation in the State, and how far are they bound to work against it? Now there can be no doubt of the duty resting on every Catholic citizen to oppose to the uttermost anti-Catholic legislation. For good or for evil the State in no small measure affects the moral and spiritual life of its individual citizens. When the laws permit of easy divorce, there will be no high ideal of marriage amongst the mass of its citi-

zens; class legislation tends to accumulate class-selfishness, and thus a moral atmosphere is created to which the weaker characters will always succumb. Indifference therefore may easily become culpable neglect of duty on the part of the citizen who fails to use his civil rights or to assert himself against laws which encourage an anti-Christian conception of life.

At the same time however it is to be borne in mind that the Christian State is constructed not so much by laws as by conscience. The statute book may conceivably be a perfect application of the Sermon on the Mount, whilst the lives of the citizens are its uttermost denial. The absence of divorce laws does not necessarily mean that the marriage vow is kept inviolate amongst the people; the most stringent regulations of the drink traffic are not necessarily synonymous with perfect sobriety. In a wisely-regulated community the law always bears a very direct relation to the conscience of the citizens, nor is it ever wise for legislation to run far ahead of the popular conscience. When it does so it defeats its own purpose and remains little more than a dead letter; or if it is active at all it usually operates in a direction contrary to that for which it is intended, intensifying

the evil it would correct. Hence the wise course is often to tolerate legislation which cannot be approved, and to turn one's energies to the elevating of the moral consciousness of the people. For the State can be justly expected to uphold the Christian consciousness only when it actually exists amongst its citizens. To do otherwise would be an unwarrantable tyranny. It belongs to the Church primarily to create the Christian consciousness, not to the State. Hence our first duty as Catholics is to arouse and educate the moral sense of the people and gradually to elevate their ideal of conduct. Then when the moral sense is aroused, must we see that the laws of the State are such as guard and foster the conscience of the nation. The principle to be borne in mind is that whilst the State is bound to give expression in its legislation to the Christian consciousness of its citizens, this duty falls upon it only in proportion to the development of the Christian consciousness amongst its citizens. And the duty of fostering the Christian consciousness belongs primarily and directly to the Church, not to the State.

It is only by a due appreciation of these fundamental principles that we Catholics can hope to save the Christian character of the nation from the secularist onslaught.

The time has come or is fast coming when the State must be either frankly Christian or frankly secularist. The alliance between Christianity and the neo-paganism of the Renaissance has broken down. But we cannot too well bear in mind that what makes a nation Christian is not the existence of a concordat, whether formal or informal, nor the mere recognition of God and the Church in the statute-book. A Christian nation is one whose principles of government is in accordance with the Catholic conception of life. And the Catholic conception of life recognizes a threefold sovereignty: of Church, State and Family, and holds as sacred the principle of personal liberty. Only in a State in which these principles are recognized does the Catholic life find its proper development.

Were this fact more widely understood, secularism would, I believe, be deprived of its chief weapon. Catholicism is regarded generally as a sectarian interest inimical to the welfare of the people at large. Were it recognized for what it truly is, as a broad human policy, reaching indeed unto the heavens, but having its foundations deep in the aspirations which elevate human existence here on earth, then would it gain the nation's ear and have power to save.

Our duty then is to take our stand by

Catholic principle in so far as it already forms part of the nation's life, and to strive to introduce it where it is wanting. Nor can we afford to throw away the opportunities which are given us in the exercise of our civic rights. It may be said that Catholics in English-speaking countries are a small minority. But small minorities can do much, if they are compact and in earnest. It is in fact usually the vigorous minority that wins. At any rate, minority though we are, the upholding of the Christian character of the State rests with us, and as this fact becomes manifest to the people at large, we shall gather to ourselves whatever of genuine Christianity remains in the land.

But let us bear in mind at this day that our strength lies in identifying ourselves with the welfare of the nation, and not in standing apart as though we were strangers in the land. The nation's interests are our interests; the people's cause, our cause. This in truth is the very strength of Catholicism that it does not stand for any sectarian interest, but for the nation itself. To-day this claim may be scoffed at by the multitude, but if we Catholics are true to ourselves the logic of events will yet justify it. Meanwhile, whatever others may say, our path is clear and our duty imperative.

The Education of Woman

The impetus given to the education of women has been one of the most striking achievements of the past century. Every woman with any claim to an education is now expected to know something about most things that interest her brothers; nor can we say where woman's ambition will lead her in search of academic conquests. There has been much senseless jargon and fussiness about it all; yet when the chaff has been sifted away, this good thing remains: woman's intelligence is now recognized as compeer with that of the man. She is no longer regarded as essentially inferior to the man in the higher qualities of human nature.

This emancipation undoubtedly marks a positive advancement in the history of civilization. For a people's ideal of women is one of the supreme factors in the making of moral and social life. In a large sense it may be said that woman's possession of her own, marks the triumph of right over might, of moral power over physical.

And yet, as is the case with all revolutions, the achievement has been encum-

bered with much foolishness and intemperance of word and deed. Long ago, when the movement was in its first fervour, Ruskin uttered the warning that woman's equality with man does not mean her identity with him. Woman is not a lesser man, nor a greater; not even a man at all. She is ever woman, and her power and dignity are derived as much from that in which she differs from man as from that in which she is at one with him. Nay, her proper power depends upon maintaining the difference; for in so far as she loses the individuality of her womanhood, she becomes but a sorry double of the proper man. The ignoring of this fact by so many of the loudest agitators for "woman's rights," is what has surrounded the feminist movement with much mockery and unreality. Whatever the agitator may say, the common sense of mankind is assured that the difference of woman from man is not merely one of physical form and function, but of mental character and moral force.

If then we would avoid the snares which have overbalanced so many feminist advocates, we must have some clear conception of what the true woman is, lest we make of the growing woman something not herself and less than the man she is imagined to be.

Now the true woman is by nature the indicator of the moral ideal and the nurse of mankind: she is at once judge and physician. In her, in the highest sense, justice and mercy meet; but the foundation of her character is devotion to the ideal. Hence it does not belong to her to legislate or to fight the world's battles: these functions belong to the man. His office it is to build up constitutions, direct policies and generally to deal with all matters that demand a certain compromise between the ideal and the actual. Woman of her nature is less fitted to arrange such compromises. A man usually views ideals from a point of view bearing on the actual world around him, and is apt to be satisfied when he attains the point where the actual and the ideal offer least resistence to each other. His temptation is to worship the merely actual, to be impatient of the ideal. In any case he instinctively allows room for the actual.

But a true woman cherishes the ideal with a certain absolute devotion; so that to her the necessary compromise which makes up the actual life of the world is tolerable only in as far as it bears the reflection of the ideal and gives promise of its fuller realization. When she regards the actual world otherwise, she is conscious of betraying the ideal she wor-

ships. If she is a wise woman she recognizes her impotence to realize the ideal at a bound and is grateful to those who in any way help to bring the actual and the ideal into closer harmony. But though in her wisdom she may be tolerant of compromise, she never ceases to deplore its necessity; and is seldom fully convinced of the necessity. This prejudice will often make her unjust in regard to those who, honestly seeking to realize the ideal, yet recognize the necessity of a gradual advancement.

At the same time this absolute devotion to the ideal and this prejudice against compromise constitute woman, in regard to moral life, the world's natural "speculum justitiæ—the mirror of right-living," in which mankind beholds its higher self. And thus her especial office in the world is to bear witness to the highest life man can attain to, and inexorably to approve or condemn the actual by its relation to the ideal towards which man ought to tend. Her function it is to beckon man ever forward to greater moral achievement, nor to allow him to rest in aught other than the highest he is capable of. His part it is to fashion the world; hers to maintain the moral standard by which his work must be judged.

But it belongs to her not merely to

judge of the moral value of man's work; hers it is to assist him in the realization of the ideal she holds before him; to strengthen him in his moments of weakness, to cheer him onward, to bear witness to his valour in an honourable fight, to bind up the wounds after the conflict and generally to foster the realization of her best hopes of him by timely counsel and sympathy.

This duty of fostering pity and sympathy is implied in that other duty of witnessing to the ideal. For it is a most subtle injury to set a law upon others unless you are prepared to assist their weakness in the observance of the law. And so it is that every woman is appointed by nature nurse and foster-mother of mankind. Like her heavenly proto-type, the Virgin Mother, she is not only "Speculum Justitiæ—Mirror of Justice," but also "Health of the Sick," "Refuge of Sinners," "Consoler of the Afflicted," and in the uniting of all these qualities she attains her queenly sovereignty. For this fostering care of mankind is she fitted by that exquisite sensitiveness which is part of the true woman's nature, and enables her, when not turned back upon herself, intuitively to appreciate the needs of others. Hence no greater injury can be done to woman than to blunt this sensitiveness

which is so necessary a condition of her proper life. Only what is frequently needed is that she learn to turn this sensitiveness to account for the understanding, comforting and healing of her fellow-creatures, and not for the indulgence of her vanity and self-love.

In any scheme of woman's education, therefore, these two fundamental qualities of her character must ever be kept in view —her idealism and her sensitiveness; for in these two natural qualities we find the predominating marks of true womanhood.

And yet, thus boldly stated, this presentment of the truth leaves much to be desired in view of the objects aimed at by the feminist movement. The fact is, of course, that many qualifications enter into perfect womanhood which are not expressed in these two predominant notes of her character; and which, though subordinate to her idealism and sensitiveness, are yet necessary for the proper development of these two qualities. Here we may state at once that whatever enters into the composition of the perfect man must in some degree be found in the perfect woman, just as all true feminine qualities are in a measure to be found in the highest masculine character. For the distinction between man and woman is not so much absolute as relative: both possess

all human qualities, only in each those qualities predominate which determine the distinctive function in life. So that the mark of the true woman is not the absence of masculine qualities, but their due subordination to the distinctive marks of her womanhood. The making of the true woman is in fact not a question of exclusion, but of right subordination. In considering it a question of exclusion is where the educationalists of a former time went astray; in failing to see that there is a question of right subordination is where many educationalists of to-day go equally astray. But without enclosing a woman's education within any narrow lines that mark her off from her proper participation in the interests of her brothers, it is yet evident that the chief concern of her education must be to safeguard and develop her womanly traits. Now it is a truism that in one's strength lies one's weakness. The very idealism and sensitiveness which are the strength of woman and the conditions of her power amongst men, are apt to be a source of weakness unless her whole human nature is healthily exercised and developed. Her idealism may easily make her unjust in her judgements unless her intelligence is equal to the problem before her; her sensitiveness may leave her a prey to emotion unless she knows

the secret of self-control. Her education then should proceed along two chief lines —the strengthening of her self-control whilst preserving her womanly sensitiveness, and the enlarging of her mental outlook upon the actual world whilst fostering her proper idealism. In so far as the present feminist movement is achieving these aims, it is good. Undoubtedly in securing for woman a greater freedom for self-development it is giving her the opportunity for exercising her womanly prerogatives in a larger measure than heretofore; and in her greater freedom she will learn that self-control in which she is apt most to fail. To see in the increased independence of women merely a danger to her womanliness is surely to look merely at the surface of things. That there is a danger is evident; but it is equally certain that independence developes self-dependence and fosters self-control, and these conditions are proper to a truly human life. To deny them to woman is to deny her a human right. To safeguard the modern woman against the danger of her newly acquired independence no surer method can be found than to convince her that the right of independence is coincident with the duty of self-control. Undoubtedly in her most exalted independence a wo-

man requires certain external safeguards, which the greater physical force of the man renders unnecessary, nor will any wise woman disregard them. Nevertheless, it remains true that the independent woman's greatest danger lies in her own emotional nature, unsecured by the control of her more spiritual faculties of intelligence and will.

But for the full exercise of her prerogative a woman must be self-dependent; and the conditions which make for greater self-dependence are therefore to be welcomed, even whilst the dangers are recognized and guarded against. Nothing perhaps has so hampered the proper development of woman as the exaggerated notion of her dependence on the man, which so widely prevails. That she does depend upon him in some measure is of course not questioned. Ordinarily a man has a broader outlook on life, a juster balance of judgement, a greater power of resistance against adverse circumstances; and in these respects the woman naturally turns to him to supply her own deficiency. Yet this dependence can be easily exaggerated, and the tendency is to exaggerate it. The self-reliant, strenuous type of woman, so frequently produced in circumstances which give a woman greater

opportunities of exercising her latent powers, proves conclusively that nature never meant her to be a mere satellite of man, finding her life in revolving around his. Rather has nature endowed her in such wise that she may be man's independent ally and co-worker. But this she can never be whilst she lacks sufficient self-reliance and strength of character to enable her, if need be, to stand apart. A woman's education, therefore, should aim at developing her latent powers of resistance and self-dependence, so as to enable her to face the world alone without a probability of failure. Only in so far as this is accomplished is the perfect woman possible.

But it will be said such an education will unfit her for marriage or render her less willing to marry. Already, it is said, the greater independence of women renders them more difficult in regard to marrying. As regards the objection that the education we claim for her unfits a woman for marriage, no objection could be more absurd; for a self-dependent woman will make a better wife and mother than a woman helpless or servile. And as regards the charge that such education makes them less willing to marry, what does it amount to but a confession that many women marry by a sort of moral compulsion, and

that if they were less dependent they would not marry. And is it not evident that such a condition of affairs is degrading to the marriage bond? Marriage must be a perfectly free contract, entered into for the higher perfection of two lives, if it is to reach the sacred ideal of the Christian sacrament; and this can be only when the woman as well as the man is entirely free to consent or refuse on motives of a spiritual nature, and not as constrained by merely material interests. Moreover, it is altogether opposed to the Christian conception of woman to think that her destiny in life is invariably the marriage state. That the majority of men and women find the proper development of their lives in marriage is true. It is equally certain that many can live fuller and more perfect lives outside the marriage state. And this freedom applies to women equally as to men. Such has been the teaching of the Church from the beginning, and with steadfast purpose has she consecrated the single life devoted to God and good works. And in maintaining woman's freedom to marry or not to marry, the Church has at once guarded the proper liberty of human life and the sacredness of the marriage bond. The sanctity of Christian marriage implies the duty of the single life, when by a single life one can attain to a fuller perfection.

Thus, far from interfering with the just claims of marriage, woman's self-dependance enhances its liberty and sacredness.

It is certain, however, that the moral education of woman is intimately connected with her intellectual training. A mean intellectual outlook will distort the keenest moral judgment and render it ineffectual. Perfectly to fulfil her proper purpose, both as the vindicator of the ideal and nurse of humanity, a woman needs intellectual sympathies of the highest order; to her science, philosophy and art should not be a closed book, but an open page. She need not be an expert in any particular branch of knowledge, but she must at least have sufficient knowledge to enable her to sympathize with her fellow-mortals in their intellectual developments; otherwise she will be less a companion to man than a hindrance, and fail to elicit that confidence in her moral judgements, upon which her proper sovereignty depends. Every woman, therefore, has a natural right to an intellectual education sufficient to enable her to be a sympathetic companion in that sphere of the world's life in which she is called by birth or ability to move. But her intellectual equipment must ever be considered in reference to her moral vocation; for her, even less than for the man, is intellectual achievement to be regarded as an end in

itself; but rather must it ever be but a means to a fuller exercise of her womanly prerogatives. To act otherwise would be a betrayal of her womanhood. For this reason no true woman can find contentment in merely intellectual pursuits in the same degree as is possible to men. It has been said, with that measure of truth which general statements contain, that a man finds his goal in Truth and a woman, hers in Goodness. This much at least is certain, that with the true woman intellectual achievement is less appreciated than moral character; she values a man not for what he knows, but for what he does and is. With her, too, philosophy ever ends in religion, and this by a natural compulsion of her nature. She is impatient to embody her vision of the Good in conduct and in actual being. The True, apart from its relation to moral action, does not absorb her.

And herein lies a danger: frequently in her impatience to compass some moral or religious act she ignores that intellectual training which is requisite for the highest human act, and so her moral action and her religion are apt to be too exclusively based on sentiment and affection, to the detriment of "a reasonable service," and her will power is too often developed without regard for her intellect: so she often lacks that well-balanced liberty of soul which an

active intelligence alone can give. Her affections are apt to run in narrow grooves, and her religion to be wanting in sufficient robustness to convince the world of its perfect sincerity. And thus, with so many religious women in the world, mankind remains so largely uninfluenced by religion. It would not be so were religious women able to challenge the religious indifference around them with a more intelligent and reasonable witnessing to their faith. To the indifferent world their religion seems too often to be secured by intellectual apathy. On the other hand an intelligent religious woman, alive to the intellectual interests of the world in which she lives, never fails to impress and persuade, even when she does not wholly convince. For her intellectual sympathies give her the key to the *minds* of others, and to understand the minds of others is as necessary as the understanding of their hearts; yet it is in this matter that women so frequently fail.

On all accounts therefore it is good that woman should receive a liberal and generous education and be encouraged to make herself acquainted with all matters of knowledge which will increase her sympathy and give her a juster judgement. Nor should a woman look merely to the immediate circle around her to know how far her studies will be of use

to her. Her proper test is her own ability; her circumstances are but the modifying element in her life, not its standard of progression. A woman who has to gain her own livelihood will necessarily give a large share of attention to those particular branches of knowledge upon which depends her power to earn her bread. But she should nevertheless not exclude other intellectual pursuits for which she has ability and taste. So too a woman with a particular object to attain to, will wisely make that object a centre of her studies, yet would be foolish to shut out all intellectual sympathies which have no immediate bearing upon it. Much inefficiency is due to this mistake; for the very fact of having intellectual interests not directly associated with any particular aim, tends to preserve that freshness of spirit which is essential to efficient work. Hence, as I say, a woman's intellectual development must be guided not so much by her circumstances as by her own proper power and interests. She is herself the centre of her life and its guiding force; she ought never to surrender herself to any merely extraneous force whatever.

Keeping then in mind the proper traits of true womanhood, we Catholics have every reason to welcome the broader

education woman now claims. It is her right—a right consecrated by the tradition of Catholicism. For Catholicism has fostered the conception of womanhood, to which this latest movement pays homage. With her unerring instinct for the needs of human nature, the Church has ever refused to recognize the absolute dependence of the woman on the man, whilst at the same time holding fast by the essential distinction of woman's function from that of the man in the social life of the race. Woman, in the eyes of the Church, is the free and independent ally of man; and while safeguarding her weakness in the presence of the more forceful personality of the man, the Church has ever fostered her strength and secured her individuality. Through long ages of untutored barbarism and but half-disciplined brute force, the nun's veil was the charter of woman's freedom; and in the cloisters were developed types of strong, independent womanhood, to which the present world might well look for examples of the perfect woman. I do not mean that all nuns have been perfect women. In their seclusion from the wider life of the world or in their concentration upon one particular work, they are apt to neglect that intellectual development which is neces-

sary for the fullest exercise of woman's prerogatives. But this only means that human nature even in the cloister easily falls short of the ideal pursued by the wisest policy. Nevertheless the veil of the nun has been the symbol of an emancipated womanhood, and has given to the marriage ring a nobler and more sacred significance than would be possible were women less independent in the choice of her own life. It is for us to pursue this same ideal of a strong, self-dependent, intellectual womanhood, and to encourage whatever tends to compass its realization.

Marriage

It belongs to the genius of Christianity to discover in the temporal the germ of the eternal. The spirit of Christ entering into human life does not destroy but perfects; it takes our life as it is, and out of the merely natural or earthly raises up the supernatural and heavenly. And in this it is so completely at variance with the spirit of the Manichean, which sees in visible nature a mere denial of the invisible, and in our earthly life only what is bad. But to the Christian spirit the world in which we live, with its natural phenomena and its human relationships and affections, is essentially good; transitory in so far as it is earthly, yet at the same time not altogether transitory, since whatever is temporal has a latent eternal possibility and indicates, whilst it veils, some eternal reality. Nay more; when rightly understood and dealt with, the visible world leads us to the knowledge and enjoyment of the invisible and eternal; draws us into communion with the spiritual. The Christian spirit thus beholds a sacramental value in all nature, but especially in human nature. For this

reason any abuse of the gifts and joys of nature is so much more a sin, since it is a perversion to evil, brutish ends, of what in itself is destined to lead us on to the spiritual and usher us into the eternal. It is the consciousness of the eternal in the temporal which more than aught else differentiates man from the brute; and it is the object of the Church to foster and develop this consciousness in all the relations of human life. When Pope Gregory the Great told St Augustine not to destroy the pagan temples of the Anglo-Saxon nor to abolish pagan festivals, but to purify and consecrate the temples for Christian worship, and transform the festivals into Christian festivals, he did but apply in this particular instance the universal principle of Catholic Christianity.

It is not nature which is evil, but our abuse of nature, and our blindness to the sacramental character of nature.

This truth is nowhere more intimately revealed than in the Catholic conception of marriage. Here we have one of the primary institutions of the civilized state taken over into the Christian life, consecrated by a sacramental blessing and regarded as one of the seven sacramental foundations of the Church. Marriage is not regarded by Christianity as a mere accident of life, it is not tolerated as a ne-

cessary evil; but it is taken as a recognized vocation essential to the building up of the Church on earth, and thereby entering into the scheme of the world's salvation. Husband and wife have their part to do in the life of the Church and in the work of transforming the world into God's kingdom, just as the priest and the consecrated virgin have their part; and it is from its relation to the divine economy of the Church that Christian marriage derives its sanction and peculiar sanctity. Christians, according to the mind of the Gospel, marry in order to give effect to the divine plan of human society; and this they do not merely by carrying on the human race, but by the creation of a domestic society, which shall be in itself a microcosm, containing the germ of the larger society of the Christian world; and it is upon the foundation of this smaller society of the Christian home that the larger society of the Church is built. The home is, as it were, the domestic chapel from which is fed the more extended life of the basilica; and as the Christian character of that is, so will this be. Marriage, therefore, in the Christian dispensation cannot be separated from the idea of that home-life upon which Christian society is built as upon a proto-typal foundation. Marriage is for the home, and the home for the Church.

Such is the Catholic idea, and it at once gives the answer to the free-love theories so unhappily undermining the domestic morality of the modern nations. All these theories assume that marriage is a matter of merely personal convenience or pleasure. They ignore the truth, oftentimes so painfully borne in upon us, of the social responsibilities attaching to individual life; they seem unconscious of the fact that mere personal pleasure or inclination is no criterion of true self-development. The free-love theory in its furthest application is a denial of all social responsibility whatever; in its less extreme forms it is a denial of Christianity. Whether from a Christian or a non-Christian point of view marriage is always the ordering and control of a natural instinct for the purpose of realizing social unity. In every case mere personal interest and gratification is subordinated to more unselfish ends. But from a non-Christian or secularist point of view the social purpose of marriage, whilst it imposes certain restraints, does not absorb the natural instinct into an abiding law and purpose, ever present in a man's life, and rendering mere self-indulgence always sinful; whereas in Christian society this is the case. Christianity places the sexual instinct under a spiritual law, and permits its gratification only for the defi-

nite purpose of creating a Christian home. Apart from this end any gratification of the sexual instinct is sinful, since it contravenes the divine purpose in human nature.

Marriage, therefore, according to Christian teaching, demands an entire surrender of mere natural impulse to one only purpose, the building up a Christian society through the home: and it is only when we recognize this that the laws of the Church regarding marriage are seen to be intelligible and consistent. We see at once how the Church, regarding the home as the germ of Christian society and the type of Christian social life, can neither tolerate the free-love theory nor any theory which places the supreme control of the marriage bond either in the individual or in the State. The integrity and stability of the home is essential to Christian social life, and therefore the Church can never surrender her claim to be the supreme arbiter in matters concerning the stability and sanctity of the marriage bond.

We can see now what answer the Church must make to all arguments in favour of divorce. Marriage, it is urged by the advocates of divorce, is meant to enable husband and wife to live more happily in this world; its primary object is to

secure the happiness of the married parties. Consequently, when it proves to be conducive rather to their misery than their happiness, it is only just that they should be freed from each other. Further, it is urged, to force a man or woman to live together when they prove to be unfitted for each other is to tempt them to throw off all responsibility and seek pleasure unlawfully, thus putting the legal bond to scorn and robbing it of all respect. But to this argument the Church can only reply that though it is true that marriage is meant to conduce to the happiness of husband and wife, yet it is not true to say that this is its ultimate object, except in so far as the happiness of anyone is bound up with their true vocation in life. Husband and wife are supposed to find their happiness in their home and in each other's companionship; but the right object of their marriage is to create the home and make it a centre of Christian life. To this purpose husband and wife are supposed to dedicate themselves when they take the marriage vow; and this purpose alone justifies them in taking their vow. Marriage, therefore, under the Christian law demands a sacrifice of that ultra-individualism which is taken to justify divorce, nor can the Church consistently consider such ultra-

individualism afterwards as a plea for the dissolution of the marriage bond. Marriage, in fact, implies in the contracting parties a surrender of the individual to the Christian purpose, and in this surrender the individual who is properly called to the marriage state finds that higher development of his personal self, which is found in all self-sacrifice which proceeds from a sense of duty and religion.

What the Church then demands of husband and wife, from the moment that they are united in wedlock, is that they put aside all thought of self in so far as it tends to turn them aside from their proper purpose; for husband and wife no longer belong to themselves, they are consecrated to a purpose above and beyond themselves, and to turn their thoughts backwards upon their personal interest or pleasure to the detriment of the purpose to which they are dedicated, is a violation of their vow and a sacrilege. The Church, therefore, can never sanction any law or institution which tends to introduce personal pleasure or interest into the marriage relation to the detriment of that purpose for which alone under the Christian dispensation marriage is instituted, or which tends to foster an ideal at variance with that of the Gospel. To sanction divorce would be to recognize a purpose in

marriage other than that which alone she does recognize.

This only can the Church grant in consideration of human weakness and fallibility, that in certain cases husband and wife may be permitted to live apart. Even in this matter the action of the Church is controlled by the idea of the stability of the home or the general welfare of society. Permission to live apart is granted only when it is evident that the continuing to live together will not conduce to the sanctity or integrity of home life. Such permission too is granted only by way of exceptional legislation designed to lighten the burden of useless suffering, but not to infringe in any way the essential stability of the marriage institution. It may happen even to the most thoughtful and conscientious man or woman to have chosen a partner in marriage with whom it is morally impossible to live with self-respect, or whose entire want of sympathy or moral conduct renders the life of the other an excessive burden. To such the Church extends the indulgence of a legal separation; yet in bending so far to human weakness she preserves the radical bond; husband and wife still remain husband and wife. The ideal of the Church is thus vindicated even in legal separation,

and neither party, therefore, is at liberty to marry again.

It may be said: "This doctrine is hard; this ideal too high; and human nature is weak." That was in effect what the early disciples said when our divine Saviour laid down this doctrine for the first time. They said: "If the case of a man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry."* But our Saviour did not modify His teaching because of their timidity. His faith in human nature was greater than theirs. He replied that indeed it was not expedient for some to marry, either for physical reasons or because they were called to duties in the kingdom of God which make it expedient not to marry. But He did not modify His law of marriage to meet their fears. And of those who do not marry He demanded self-restraint: a self-restraint even greater than that demanded by the marriage vow: for the command holds good for all, whether married or unmarried, that "even to look upon a woman to lust after her is to commit adultery with her in the heart." In truth in all matters concerning marriage and purity the Gospel is austere; and when we consider its scope and purpose, could we expect it to be

* Matt. xix, 10.

otherwise? Christ came into the world to lift the world up; to free men from the tyranny of sense-pleasure by which they are ever drawn downwards towards the level of the brute creation, and so to constitute man once more in that spiritual perfection which is properly his. For this reason he appealed always to man's higher nature; to the spiritual in man, not to the brutish. The law of marriage which He promulgated is hard only in so far as men are guided in their desires by the lower instincts, whereas Christ will recognize as a legitimate rule of human life only the higher, more spiritual, instincts. Before the coming of Christ the recognized purpose of marriage was largely the gratification of passion, within certain limits made necessary by the well-being of the community. But Christian marriage was put at once upon a more spiritual foundation. Christ's union with humanity became the law of the union between husband and wife, and Christ's love of the Church became the law of conjugal affection. As Christ loves the Church with a pure, self-sacrificing love, and as His love finds its gratification in realizing God's kingdom amongst men by the union of Himself with humanity, so must husband and wife love each other and find their highest gratification in realizing

through each other God's kingdom on earth. This true love—true at once to God and to man's own higher nature—was to supplant mere sensual passion and be the basis upon which the sacramental structure of the married state was to be reared. And it is only where this love exists that the perfection of the Christian ideal can be realized. It is this love which the Church demands of husband and wife when they vow to love each other and take each other "for better, for worse," till death do them part. But this vow implies that there be already in their hearts that love for each other which they vow to give till death: and when this love is wanting marriage is a desecration and hardly less than a perjury before God.

And how can aught but disaster come from a marriage which is lacking in the very fundamental condition upon which the sacramental state is based? Surely it is a case of a house built upon the sands, and the result too often verifies the warning of the Gospel when the winds and storms of life beset such a house.

In a large measure in fact the war between the Church and the divorce court is as to whether society shall be founded upon this true love or upon selfish indulgence. True love of its very nature is per-

manent and stable. "*Fortis est ut mors dilectio*—love is strong as death": for it depends not upon one's pleasure. It may bring pleasure with it or it may bring pain. But it depends essentially upon the recognition that in being true to another, one is true to oneself, and that in this fidelity to another one realizes oneself. And in this, love differs from mere passion which seeks its own pleasure and thrives on self-gratification. But it is in true love —the love strong as death—that Christian marriage finds the proper condition for its existence and perfection.

Is it then to be wondered at that so many marriages are failures when we consider how many have for their chief motive some merely personal interest or social advancement or mere temporary passion? Never shall we do away with the divorce court until we convince the new generation of the proper responsibilities incurred in the marriage state, and bring them to abhor the loveless marriage. Chief amongst the sinners upon whose souls rests the guilt of the growing disregard for the sanctity of marriage, are those who whilst professing to respect the indissolubility of the marriage bond, yet have emptied the institution of its high moral and spiritual significance. They would have marriage

indissoluble, yet teach their children to regard it more as a social convention than as a religious institution, more as a stepping stone to worldly prosperity or influence than as a sacramental vocation. How can we be surprised if with such teaching dinned into their souls from their earliest years, these children grow to manhood or womanhood, and having achieved a "successful" marriage, kick against the restraints and responsibilities which are derived only from the higher ideal of which they have learnt nothing?

At the present time indeed it is more than ever necessary that the right purpose and condition of marriage should be kept clearly in mind. We live in an age of deep transitions. The past century witnessed the break up of the social system under which our grandparents were reared and which was to them second nature; and the ultimate phase of the evolution of the new social forms is yet far off. Meanwhile there is a restlessness, a groping after new forms and categories in which to embody the spirit of the present. But this is certain: young men and women have found greater personal independence, and claim the chief voice in determining their own vocation. Nor will they easily surrender their greater liberty; and if they would, I

doubt whether it would be for the good of the world that they should. For the moment indeed the tendencies of the age are strongly materialist, and amidst such tendencies the newly found liberty of the young is apt to make not for spiritual elevation as much as for success in what the Scripture terms "the world." But if we would grapple with the situation with any chance of success, we must recognize that much of the moral laxity and religious indifference of the time is in reality not so much a rebellion against religion and Christian conduct as against the inconsistency and insincerity which has so widely marked the accepted presentments of Christian teaching. For example, in regard to this question of marriage, the Christian law of indissolubility has been much insisted on, whilst in other respects the ideal of marriage put forward has been altogether unchristian. Were the purpose of marriage none other than that so frequently inculcated by worldly Christian parents, then indeed were the law, which declares it indissoluble, hard and unjust. If people are to marry for merely worldly motives, then marriage, being reduced to a worldly convention, has no claim to greater stability than any other civil contract. It is indissoluble only because it is more than a civil con-

tract, and a part of the divine economy of the Church. If we would convince men of the justice of the indissolubility of marriage, we must make them understand its true character and purpose; and if we would have them faithfully fulfil that purpose we must ban the loveless marriage. Thus only can we meet the evil of the divorce court and secure for Christian marriage its proper sanctity.

The Value of Work

To the majority of men there is hardly a greater evil in life than having nothing definite to do, no particular business or profession. A definite occupation is in itself a moral discipline. To have to be up and doing at a certain time, to have to think of something other than oneself or one's idle fancies, is to most men little less than spiritual salvation. It matters not much what the work is, so that it is honest; its value lies not so much in its immediate usefulness or inherent quality as in its moral effect on the worker himself. Even the most menial work may thus have a high moral value. But work and a definite occupation of some kind are essential to a healthy moral life.

This truth has been recognised by almost all moral reformers. In the monastic orders it plays a prominent part in daily life. The monastic rules all regard idleness as a capital sin, the source of temptations. When not engaged in prayer, the monk had allotted to him work of another kind, either manual or mental, and as in many other ways so in the

history of labour the monk plays no ignoble part. There have been of course idle monks: monastic orders are not made up of angels. But the idle monk has ever been one who has fallen away from the monastic ideal and lost the monastic spirit; and in the reform of orders we find the obligation of being constantly and usefully employed, generally emphasised.

Nor are the monastic orders alone in their insistence on the duty of working: ethical reformers of all sorts have taken much the same line. The Brook Farm community in America, and Tolstoi in Russia, are instances in modern times. And it is to be noticed that the monastic orders have this in common with the socialistic enthusiasts referred to, that they all impose manual labour. Intellectual effort might be encouraged and fostered amongst the monks, but side by side with study went some form of manual work, at least in the more primitive communities. Later on, as the conditions of society became more complex, and the demands upon the activity of the monks became more varied, manual labour largely gave way to missionary and social work. Nevertheless, even then manual labour was held in honour and kept its place as a primary element in the monastic dis-

cipline, having its place in the life of the community even though in individual cases it might give place to other demands. But a difference in the attitude of the monk towards labour from that of the socialistic enthusiast must here be noted, as it marks off the Catholic spirit from the secularist. Prayer with the monks was considered the highest occupation, and the duty of having external occupations was contingent upon certain temporal conditions. In exceptional cases indeed a monk might be dispensed from ordinary external work, and be allowed to give himself entirely to prayer and contemplation. The moral value of manual labour and external activities was taken to be not absolute, but relative. It was considered necessary partly as a preventive of idleness between the hours of prayer, partly as an ordinary means of securing a healthy, physical and mental life, and partly it entered into the discipline of monastic poverty. In a word, external occupation was considered to be a moral discipline which was undoubtedly necessary for the ordinary individual, but not an absolute law of the moral life; some people might indeed perfect their souls without it. The idea of making any form of external occupation absolutely obligatory without exception would have

been considered by the monastic legislators as an infringement of that liberty of soul which belongs to man in his relation with God. And herein lies one of the essential differences between the Catholic idea and the secularist. Nevertheless, for ordinary mortals some external occupation was considered by the monks necessary to a sound moral life.

Now the monastic discipline gives us the key to the right Catholic attitude in regard to this question. For the monastic life in its first elements is but a more intense form of the Christian life. Though we may not say with the secularist that *external* occupation is an absolute law of social ethics, yet we are to hold that an idle life—a life devoid of social usefulness, material or spiritual—is always wrong, a crime against the social body, as well as against one's own soul. And the social injustice of an idle life does not arise merely when a man becomes a burden on the public rates or on private charity. He may indeed have sufficient inheritance to support him in idleness, and yet the injustice against the social body will remain. For every man, be he rich or poor, is obliged by the natural law of human society to contribute his part towards the common good. An idle millionaire therefore sins against social

justice equally with the idle beggar, and perhaps more so, since his wealth and education gives him larger opportunities for serving society. It is in truth in the essential solidarity of the human race that the social injustice of the idle life begins. No man belongs entirely to himself: society has always an unquestionable claim upon him. In the widespread awakening of the popular mind to this truth lies in fact much of the strength of the socialist propaganda. The socialists, in insisting upon the solidarity of society, have become to an increasing number of men the exponents of a deep moral truth. It is a truth to which Catholicism has borne evidence throughout the long ages of its history; but the socialists, by preaching this doctrine with a loud voice and perpetual insistence, have made themselves in popular estimation its proper exponents. In opposing the socialist propaganda, Catholics have perhaps failed to recognize sufficiently this Catholic truth behind the vagaries and errors of socialist teaching, and thereby have seemed to the populace to ignore it. Where the socialist goes astray in the application of this truth is that he seeks to realize it in practices by legal coercion to the exclusion of the claims of individual conscience; he inordinately deprives the individual of a

share in the moral government of his own life, and makes him a mere creature of the State or community. Catholicism, on the other hand, seeks to realize the moral solidarity of the race by making the individual the custodian of the common good, and making him primarily answerable to God, and only in a secondary degree to the State. Thus the Church preserves inviolate the proper liberty of human life. The Socialist would force a man to labour by legal penalties; Catholicism makes his responsibility depend rather upon his own innate sense of social justice.* Not that the Church would altogether disapprove of legal pressure being brought to bear upon the idle to force them to work; only that normally her aim is as far as possible to make a man's conscience, rather than legal coercion, the guide and informant of his moral life; whereas the tendency of socialism is to supplant conscience by external law.

Hence in regard to work, the Church does not insist less upon every man's duty to work, because she maintains that this duty belongs to the higher domain of con-

* Throughout these papers, in speaking of Socialism I quote the views of the extreme school, being well aware that Socialism represents a tendency as well as a programme, and the tendency is best exemplified in the extreme party.

science which does not come altogether within the jurisdiction of the State, or because she holds to the inherent right of every individual, subject to certain moral considerations, to choose his own vocation or action. She holds that there is a universal obligation upon all men to lead an honest, useful life; and this obligation she traces to a twofold source: the duty every individual owes directly to God, to exercise his God-given powers, and the duty we all owe to society to contribute to its welfare.

According to the Catholic mind, therefore, the obligation to work would exist though society did not exist: it is inherent in the individual himself, a duty one owes to God, the Author of life; and this duty, as it is prior to the duty one owes to society, so also it governs our relation to society and the demands society may lawfully make upon us. Catholicism can never admit the right of society to determine altogether the scope of a man's work. Self-development is but another aspect of the law of self-preservation, and constitutes one of the primary duties we owe to God; and, except in certain contingencies where the duty of self-sacrifice supervenes, the preservation and development of one's own life is an inherent right of the individual which the

State may not infringe. But the development of a man's life is governed by a certain internal necessity which no external authority can altogether control or direct. There are lines of thought and action along which the individual must necessarily work, if he is to get the best out of his life; nor are any two individuals ever on exactly the same lines. Any external coercion therefore which takes a man off his own proper lines is an infringement of personal liberty, which only exceptional circumstances or the very existence of society, can justify. There are indeed cases in which the very highest self-development is attained by self-sacrifice, and when the supreme purpose of life is encompassed in death. Nor is there any true development which does not demand self-sacrifice of some sort. In self-sacrifice we may—and often do—attain to the ultimate expression of our moral and spiritual character, and so reach our highest human development. Nevertheless this development ordinarily runs upon the lines of our daily occupations, and if it is to run healthily and with a natural fulness, the individual must have a wide discretion in the choice of his own work and in its execution. And this the Catholic spirit demands.

At the same time however there are

always the just claims of society to be considered, and these claims in no small measure condition a man's proper development. No man has a right to work simply and solely for his own pleasure without reference to the public good. If a man has to bear the burden of his own life, he has also to bear some share of the burden of the social organism to which he belongs; and so whilst exercising his liberty for the realization of his own powers he must so order his life as to benefit his fellow-men. To do otherwise would be a virtual denial of that human kinship which is implied in the evangelical precept of neighbourly love. "Bear ye one another's burdens" is a law of life as revealed by Christ. We belong not wholly to ourselves, but in part to our fellow-men, and therefore we have to work so as to benefit them as well as ourselves. That is the law in few words. Exactly where the benefit to one's neighbour comes in, is sometimes a fine matter of judgement which must be left to the individual himself to decide. Society does not always recognize its own good, and not infrequently fails to see the future benefit which is plain to the active individual. The common lot of this world's benefactors is to work on in spite of the world's mockery and opposi-

tion. For the majority of men indeed it is well that they take up some work or occupation with a recognized social value attached to it; since the majority of men are not gifted with an insight and judgement superior to that of their fellows. But there are always others whose individual judgement corrects that of the majority and eventually puts it to shame. Their lives are of the greatest social value, yet are not socially recognized as such. Hence as I say the usefulness of a man's life is often a fine matter for his own judgement. Here all that we would point out is the general moral principle underlying the Christian consciousness that every man's work must have a reference to the public good as well as to his own self-development. It may be the purely spiritual influence of the Carthusian monk, or the benefit conferred by the statesman or by the ordinary citizen. But in some way or other, every man must take his share of the common burden. The drone, even though he have bonds and shares to support him; the *dilettante*, who fills up his life with hobbies of no possible benefit to the community—both are equally offenders against the social body, and properly outlaws from society.

But a question which is forced upon us

by certain modern enthusiasts is: How far is a man bound to support himself by his own labour? Is there in fact any obligation at all upon a man to earn his own bread? Tolstoi and the majority of ethical reformers of the secularist school make it a point in their programme that every man shall support himself in the sweat of his brow; it is a deduction from their denial of the right of private property. Catholicism, however, with its wider conception of human society, holds this principle in reprobation as an infringement of that right of personal liberty which is at the basis of Christian social ethics. Everyone must indeed lead a useful, honest life, so as to be of benefit to society; and in this sense, if you will, everyone must earn his bread. But it would destroy the liberty of human society and prevent the highest human development, were everyone forced to work for his bread in the narrower sense of the term. The best human work is not to be appreciated in coin, and often fails to bring the worker even a sufficiency of bread. Moreover, the principle of inheritance is inherent in the Catholic conception of society as the natural and historical extension of the individual.

Taken, therefore, as an absolute principle, no Catholic can consistently maintain that every man is morally bound to

earn his own bread in the sense in which a lawyer or a shop-keeper is said to earn his living. At the same time there is abundant Catholic authority in favour of this principle taken not absolutely, but relatively to particular persons and vocations.

Undoubtedly for the majority of men the necessity of having to work in order to live is a blessing not easily over-rated. Most men, unless their bread depends upon the performance of a certain amount of work, would not work at all. There is in the multitude an ingrained tendency to idleness which nothing but the danger of starvation can effectually hold in check. Moreover, even in the energetic there is often an inability to employ one's energies usefully, unless their path is marked out for them by some wage-earning employment. Hence, having regard for the moral conditions in which most men find themselves, who will say that it would not be well for society if a large number of those born to luxury found themselves compelled by loss of means to work for their bread? Few men are able to rise up to the opportunities of leisure and wealth. To most the freedom of a banking account acts as a narcotic, and begets aimlessness, moral and mental. They skim the surface of life, without plumbing its depths. The honest artizan tastes more

of the dignity of life in a day than the idle spendthrift is conscious of in a life-time. As "the better way" for the multitude of men, Catholicism then in the lives of numbers of her saints points to the working-man's life with approval and admonition. She sees in it a moral discipline, good for the greater number, and for some almost necessary to salvation. But she does not impose it as an absolute precept, obligatory upon all. Yet might it be well if at this day there were some such movement in favour of earning one's bread by direct labour, as in the thirteenth century there was a movement in favour of poverty. For even amongst those who have to work, labour is losing its dignity and coming to be regarded as a hateful necessity; and this not merely because of the hateful conditions which have long surrounded the working-man — though these conditions have doubtless had their influence—but because also of a growing spirit of idleness and love of pleasure infecting the whole community. From a moral point of view there is no sign more ominous in our national life. And who does not feel the pitifulness of so many lives amongst those who have no need to work in order to eat—lives latent with useful possibilities, but stunted and warped because of the absence of a

moral discipline, such as the necessity to work implies? Well might it be if we had another St Francis, who would teach men to work. And in more cases than not, useful work would mean some sort of manual work—the work of hands and feet as well as of brains.

Not without reason have the monks praised the virtue which lies in manual labour and external activity. On the one hand it was to them a healthy recréation, obviating the necessity of the harmful excitements in which a wealthy society seeks its distraction. On the other hand, it was a useful employment, and as such it had a moral value of its own; for useful employment, however menial, is the atmosphere in which self-respect and manliness flourish—at least, when the employment is of voluntary acceptance, and not taken grudgingly and with protest. In this at least the world may learn a lesson from the monks.

The Priest and Social Reform

THE economist and the priest necessarily regard social problems from different points of view. To the economist social conditions are the outcome of purely political and commercial causes; it does not fall to him to go behind these causes and trace the moral motives of the individual's action which determines so much of the happiness or misery of life. Nor is he concerned with the spiritual life. His science has for its end present utility and happiness; he is satisfied with general results, he seeks the happiness and temporal prosperity of the greatest number. His business is to create economic conditions which will render the community powerful and the majority of the people comfortable. His object is, as I say, present temporal prosperity.

Now the priest, as the spokesman of religion, looks not so much to the temporal prosperity of the people, but rather to their spiritual welfare. For him life on earth is a mystery pointing to a life beyond, and a probation by which men have to attain to an eternal, spiritual existence.

Hence, for him, the social question, like all other questions, is regarded in the light of that further existence; he sees in the actual conditions of society not so much the success or failure of certain economic causes as the fulfilment or denial of those moral and religious principles whereby man can alone become worthy of an eternal life.

This does not mean that the priestly view of social life is irreconcilable with the view of the economist, as has been sometimes asserted. It is quite possible, of course, for an economist to go beyond his science and assert that there is no future life, that true social reform can have no other object in view than the temporal welfare of the people, and that the priests who turn men's minds to the consideration of spiritual truths are unfitting them for the pursuit of that present happiness which is the only real aim of life. But in this case the economist is speaking not as an economist but as an atheist; and there is no reason why economists should be atheists. True, an intense and exclusive study of political economy, as of every other science, does tend with most men to render the intellect narrow and intolerant. The physicist frequently can see only the material side of life; the painter and musician are in danger of losing the

spiritual instinct in the worship of the sensuous. The constitution of man's mind unfortunately tends thus to narrow itself unless strongly disciplined. And so political economists have, perhaps, gained an unenviable reputation of being irreligious, because of the infidelity of many amongst them.

On the other hand, there have been priests and theologians who taboo political economy as though it were the peculiar weapon of the evil one in these latter days; especially when the economist belongs to one of the more modern and liberal schools. Knowing nothing, frequently, about the economist save that he takes a view of social problems different from that taken in the pulpit, these theologians are ready to denounce and ban, but slow to inquire and learn. It is another example of the tendency of human nature to see only one side of a question.

In truth there is enough work in our present world both for the political economist and the priest. The present age, we are frequently reminded, is in a transitional stage of existence. New modes of thought, new claims of rights, the shifting of the political powers, the increased competition in trade, and the organization of the workless, all have brought about a

social revolution, the end of which is not yet. We are moving forward we hardly know whither: it is pre-eminently the day for the political theorist. One thing is certain: the ultra-individualism of the past is doomed. Whatever the future brings forth, the voices of the social prophets and economists will not have been heard in vain. There is some truth in the phrase: "We are all socialists now." Legislation is already based upon the principle that the State must protect the weaker individual against the stronger, and that, from a Christian point of view, is a distinct step in advance of the ultra-individualism of the past. Now in the presence of these new social conditions the priest has undoubtedly a serious task. His duty it is, in a pre-eminent degree, to maintain the sanctity of life amidst all its jarring agitations and constant evolutions. And this he can do only by keeping clearly before the minds of the people those evangelical principles which are so easily forgotten in the whirl of life. It is not his duty to create economic systems; his part in the work of social reform is to set men thinking of their spiritual and moral duties towards each other. His primary object is to teach the individual to apply the Gospel to his own personal life; or, in other words, to form a Christian conscience. Yet in

doing this he is really reconstructing society, and the reconstruction he effects is the more permanent and truthful because it is based upon personal conviction and conscience.

When we are told that the Gospel can be taken as the standard for purely personal action, but not for political and social life, we at once revolt against the suggestion; our common sense will not listen to such a divorce between private life and public. Yet there is just this much truth underlying the assertion, that it is certainly useless to apply the Gospel to the public life of a nation unless it be first inculcated on the individual as the standard of his personal action. The sanctuary of the Christian life is the spirit of the individual. To gain society to Christ, to transform the social conditions from a pagan character to a Christian, the only true way of proceeding is to gain the assent of individual souls to the principles of the Gospel, and to conform the spirit of the individual unto the spirit of Christ. In a truthful state of society the social entity reflects the individual entity; if the individuals are Christians in spirit as in name, then society will be Christian; if the individuals are pagan in their own hearts, they may submit to act on Christian principles collectively, but their collective action is a

vast hypocrisy. And this is where so many of the attempted moral reformations fail. They begin with the external life, rather than with the inner life; they rush to create social reforms when they had more properly begun with the individual. They think to reform the moral life of the nation by acts of parliament or to take away vice by international agreements; they would do away with wars before they have established justice in the hearts of men; they would proclaim the brotherhood of man without any anxiety as to whether they or their neighbours apprehend the nature of brotherhood or are capable of fulfilling its duties. It is not in this fashion that the Gospel works. The Gospel is primarily a message to the individual; it presents itself to the individual as the constitution or standard of his own moral life; it works on society through the individual. Our divine Lord did not declare that wars must cease, but that all men should seek justice and righteousness. He knew that in proportion as men seek justice and righteousness, wars will cease. Neither did He forbid His followers to recognize legal slavery; but He implanted in the hearts of His disciples the principle of fraternal charity, which in time makes slavery morally impossible. Neither has He for-

bidden the competitive system in commerce. Avarice and the over-reaching of one's neighbour are forbidden—the two vices most generally coincident with the commercial spirit. The day may come when competition will give way to co-operation, but then the world will be either more Christian than it is at present, or perhaps less intelligent and less energetic. These instances illustrate the workings of the Gospel. The evangelical reform does not bear directly upon the social system, at least in the first instance, but upon the individual man; it bears directly upon acts which properly emanate from the individual, and not from the system under which he necessarily lives. Hence Christianity is tolerant of defective social systems, whilst absolutely uncompromising within the more intimate sphere of personal life.

To take an obvious illustration. Competition of its very nature lends itself to much injustice, and the sweating system might be said to be its logical outcome. Now every sincere Christian is convinced that his duty is most certainly to avoid encouraging injustice to the worker, and that consequently he should have no dealings with a firm which is known to grind or underpay its employees, or to be connected with the sweating system. So

much is the plain logic of evangelical charity. It is evident that were this principle more widely acted upon we should hear less of sweating establishments. Yet to proceed to denounce competition—as is sometimes done—as opposed to the teaching of the Gospel, is far too wide a deduction. Like every temporal system, it has its imperfections, which render it easily liable to abuse; and like most systems it has its moral advantages as well as its moral dangers. It fosters energy and self-dependence even whilst it is apt to over-ride the weak and helpless. Where the Gospel intervenes is to denounce any ruthless oppression of the weak, and individual selfishness; and in this way it modifies the eventual consequences of the system in favour of the weak, and leads men to devise ways and means more in accordance with the demands of a Christian life. And so it effects an economic reform.

Thus the Gospel is a seed sown in the human heart, which in time will grow up and spread forth branches in all domains of human life; but its root is in the sphere where individual action is by right free and unconstrained. "The kingdom of God is within you." It draws its force from within a man, from his inmost conviction of truth and right, and not from

mere external law. For that reason it is truly styled a law of liberty. It presents itself to men as a standard of life, to be accepted by each individual as his own, and to be realized in action as far as it is possible for the individual to realize it.

By thus constantly endeavouring to realize the Gospel in himself, the faithful disciple diffuses the power of the Gospel in society at large, according to the strength of his character and the prominence of his position. In fact, the heart of society is the individual. And so it is that one thoroughly perfect Christian is worth more to the world than a whole sheaf of paper laws, however admirable. For it is the living example which converts the world; the living force of a man's act it is that sends the flow of new blood through the veins of the social body, and so in time makes a new pulse to throb in the whole organization.

Economic systems, however, have their value in regard to the moral law of society, for they render a higher moral life more easy of attainment by destroying degrading conditions of existence which in some way fetter the moral life of society. Moreover, by a sort of natural law, the principles of man's inner life express themselves in the theories and systems of his social life. A morally bad economic system is

thus indicative of a false moral perception of social right or duty amongst those who constitute the dominant element in society. For example, the Manchester school was a logical consequence of the ultra-individualism of the Protestant period, and consequently would find itself essentially at variance with the spirit of Catholicism, nor could it ever hold sway where the Catholic spirit dominates. Equally at variance with Catholicism is the system of the socialists, which denies to the individual his right liberty and independence, and so destroy the notion of personal responsibility which looms so largely in the scheme of Catholic ethics. There is thus a close relationship between economics and religion, between the point of view of the political economist and that of the priest, so that one is sure sooner or later to react upon the other. An intelligent co-operation between the two is therefore always to be desired.

But in all social reforms we must bear in mind that, whilst acts of Parliament are necessary, the development of individual conscience is more necessary. Society cannot be regenerated by acts of Parliament, nor for that matter by external legislation of any kind, civil or ecclesiastical, but only by convincing men of the truth and of their duty to accept the truth.

The legislator may propound the truth in his laws, but truth which lacks individual conviction is to the individual untruth. Several popes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had legislated against luxury in the Church; it was St Francis of Assisi who convinced men of the moral value of evangelical poverty, and saved Christian society. And so it always will be. Social reform is at root individual reform: the taking to oneself of the truth and the responsibilities of life.

The Responsibility of Wealth

THE question of wealth and its possession is one that has exercised the Christian mind from the beginning, and still is a fruitful source of controversy.

There are those who read in the Gospel a condemnation of private property. "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! . . . . It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."* Again, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."† "Lay not up to yourselves treasures on earth . . . . but lay up to yourselves treasures in heaven."‡ These passages are sometimes quoted to prove that the possession of wealth is in contradiction with the Christian life, and opposed to the mind of our Saviour. Especially is stress laid upon the injunction of Christ to the young man: "Sell all whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor . . . . and come, follow me."§

On the other hand, we find our Lord the friend of those who had riches; nor

* Mark x, 23, 24.
† Matt. vi, 24.
‡ Matt. vi, 19.
§ Luke xviii, 22.

can we think that He would have given them His friendship if the holding of wealth was in His eyes a sin. Lazarus of Bethany and Joseph of Arimathea were not poor men, and it is to be remarked that our Lord did not command Zachæus to sell all that He had, but commended rather his generosity in giving one half of his goods to the poor. Moreover, in the parables the rich are frequently spoken of, not merely without censure, but their position is assumed to be quite legitimate. The man who goes into a distant country and leaves his wealth in the hands of servants to be traded with, is not rebuked. It is the indolent servant who neglects his master's interests who is condemned. Hence the attempt of those who would make of the Gospel a charter of socialism cannot possibly hold in face of our Lord's general attitude towards the rich.

The truth is that our Lord was not concerned at all with the question of wealth as an economic factor. The Gospel is not a political programme, and was never meant to be. It looks to man's spiritual perfection, and it is in reference to this spiritual perfection that our Lord regards all mundane affairs, even the possession of wealth. It made no difference to Him whether a man was rich or poor, so long as that man took care of the in-

terests of God and his own soul. Riches to the mind of Christ were manifestly a matter of temporal concern, which might be utilized for good or for evil, for the fulfilment of the Gospel or against it. If riches prevented a man from fulfilling his spiritual vocation, as in the case of the rich young man,* then they were an evil, and as such fell under condemnation. Or again, when our Lord saw men forgetful of their higher good in their anxiety to amass riches, He bewailed their lot. Far better to be poor in this world and live for eternity than be rich in temporal goods: "for what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?" †

Apart, then, from individual circumstances, our Lord's attitude towards wealth should be described as one of indifference rather than of condemnation. At the same time He did not fail to warn His disciples against the temptation of riches. "How hardly shall they who have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" So powerful is this temptation over the heart of man, that He considers it is only by a special grace of God a rich man can be saved. "With men it is impossible but not with God: for all

* Mark x, 22. † Matt. xvi, 26.

things are possible with God."* Therefore by the grace of God it is possible for a rich man to inherit the kingdom which is the reward of "the poor in spirit": if being rich, he keeps his heart detached from possession in such wise that he is ready to part with it rather than fail when conscience demands of him a surrender. And here we have the fundamental law of the Gospel concerning wealth. A man must be ready to part with it for conscience sake, and be ready, should the call come, to embrace poverty and its consequent discomfort, and "leave all things to follow Christ"; otherwise he cannot belong to the kingdom of God. Subject to that law a Christian may lawfully hold wealth; and in the holding of it he can become as perfect a disciple as he who for Christ's sake renounces wealth.

Manifestly, however, the holding of wealth must be subject to the general ideal of the Gospel, namely, the perfecting of the spiritual life and the establishment of the Christian brotherhood. Granting this condition, riches may well be made a subsidiary means for promoting the kingdom of God, even as the intellect may be, though naturally on a lower

* Mark x, 27.

plane. We know quite well that all our speculation upon eternal truths adds but little to our real knowledge of God; little, that is to say, compared with the knowledge of vision which belongs to eternity: yet even so, the knowledge we get by the exercise of our reason may be a valuable stimulus to the striving after a godly life and in no small measure may assist our spiritual advancement. In like manner, riches may indirectly at least minister to our spiritual life. The alms which are given to the poor, the wages distributed to one's employés, even the presents given to a friend, if actuated by worthy motives, have a moral bearing upon our own life, reacting upon our souls to their purification and spiritual refinement, and cementing the bond of Christian brotherhood. In the eyes of our divine Master this was the only value He saw in riches: that they are a sort of moral discipline, even whilst they are a temptation.

Wealth, then, must be considered as a trust put into the hands of the rich to be held by them not for the gratification of mere individual pleasure, nor for the fostering of worldliness, still less as a means for any actual violation of God's laws; but to minister rather to the life of the spirit. In this sense it was that

our Lord virtually approved of Zacchæus retaining his riches, since the giving away of half his income to the poor was a moral discipline, shaping his character and leading him to a higher life through thoughtfulness for the needs of others. In like manner did our Lord point out the moral value which may be attached to wealth, when He accepted the costly spikenard which the Magdalen poured upon His head and feet as a token of her repentant love.

There is then an utter difference of view regarding wealth between the Gospel and the theory of socialism, a difference very evident notwithstanding certain apparent points of contact. The socialist regards wealth from the standpoint of temporal comfort and prosperity; to him it is symbolical of that ultimate possession of the earth, which he would have every man strive for, though he would secure that no man should make it his own in any individual sense. Yet the enjoyment of this world is his highest good, and he would prohibit individual ownership only that he might distribute the enjoyment more widely. To him, therefore, wealth has a present tangible value of the highest importance; it is the keystone of his edifice.

Quite otherwise was it with our Lord. As has been remarked, His attitude towards individual ownership was one of

indifference except in so far as it affected a man's spiritual welfare. He was not indifferent to the use men made of their wealth, nor to its influence over them: but He certainly was not anxious that men should strive for riches or earthly comforts. The reason is that He did not come to create a temporal kingdom, nor to set going economic systems. He dealt with man's higher, spiritual life, and His one endeavour was to direct men's thoughts to that. He accepted the economic systems of the world, just as He accepted a suffering human body. These things belong to this world, and are to be endured and made the best of, till the kingdom is established wherein there is no suffering and no need of economic systems. Not that the Gospel favours idleness or want of energy. It gives no sanction to those who sit down under a burden and allow troubles or hardships to unman or dehumanize them. Our Lord's view seems to have been that time will rectify the ills of time, if men accept as their guide in life the eternal principles He came to reveal. But it was not the purpose of His mission to perfect the world's economic system. Only indirectly and in its moral aspect would His teaching affect the world's policy. Take away the selfishness from men's hearts and there

will not be the recklessness of competition which has brutalized so many lives, and against which the socialist rightly protests. But our Lord would have seen in the socialist's aim just as deep a worldliness and love of mere earthly pelf as in the greed of the avaricious capitalist. Both socialist and capitalist regard wealth from the point of view of earthly possession; both are intent upon material comfort and enjoyment. Thus both are equally at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. With our divine Lord the more perfect way is evidently the renouncing of wealth altogether so as to be free for God's service; and if this cannot be done, then one must holds one's wealth with a detachment of spirit not at all compatible with the socialist's thirst for earthly comfort.

Inasmuch, however, as wealth enters into one's earthly life, it must, according to the Gospel, be regarded as a trust, of which the holder must give an account to God. No man, properly speaking, has absolute ownership of any goods to do with as he wills without reference to the purpose for which it is placed in his hands by God. A man's wealth is his *under God;* and to God he must render an account of it.

As we have seen, the Gospel gives us various instances of the right use of wealth.

What strikes us most forcibly is perhaps the implied obligation of the rich to share their goods with the poor. The rich man is in a special sense God's steward to give to those in need their due measure of corn. When the socialist points to the early Christian communities as an exemplification of his theory of common property, he points to a truth even whilst clothing it in error. There can be no doubt that the early Christians did understand that the goods of the rich were in a sense the common property of the community, inasmuch as they who had, must share with those who had not. Where the socialist misreads Christian history is in depriving the individual holder of property amongst the early Christians of his personal ownership. That certain individuals did transfer their property to the common funds of the Church is certain; but they seem to have been few in number, and in any case the transfer was voluntary and in no way demanded by the Church.* The body of Christians retained their property; but in retaining it they acknowledged themselves burdened with the responsibility of providing for their poorer brethren. In the sight of God, this sharing of one's wealth with the poor was a duty, the neglect of

* Acts v, 4.

which imperilled one's salvation, inasmuch as it was a betrayal of a divine trust.

This sharing of one's wealth with the poor must, however, be taken in conjunction with the still larger duty binding upon all—rich and poor alike—of sharing oneself with one's neighbour; giving one's affection, sympathy and thought to others. Almsgiving as a Christian virtue is far from being attained if it does not include a thoughtful consideration and practical sympathy towards those with whom one shares one's wealth. Hence the reckless parting with one's money in order to get rid of a beggar and free oneself from further responsibility is hardly an act of Christian virtue; and for this reason much so-called almsgiving is not almsgiving in the Christian sense of the word. Money plays the least part in the spiritual communion of the Gospel, and divorced from the human element it tends to degrade the poor rather than to heal their misery.

Hence the rich man's responsibility for the poor goes far beyond the giving of money; he must also give of his thought, and provide such opportunities for bettering the conditions of their life as money puts into his hands. It is his duty so to manage his property as to provide labour for those willing to work. To assist a man to earn his own livelihood is a far

higher work of charity that to support him in idleness when he can work; for in work a man fosters and maintains his self-respect, and in idleness he loses it. The employer of labour who deals fairly and honestly with his workmen fulfils the law of neighbourly charity in a nobler sense than he who throws money to be scrambled for by the crowd; for such an employer shares his brains and energy as well as his money, and so fulfils the larger law. It is no more right to distribute money in such a way as to contribute to the degradation of a fellow-man than it is to squander it in mere self-indulgence. Such reckless giving of money, without thought of the consequence, may well be a sin against one's neighbour rather than a fulfilment of the law of charity.

The rich man therefore is bound by the gospel so to share his money with his fellow-men that they may be enabled to live human and Christian lives. His object must be to produce the best human results; and, as the Gospel tells us, man does not live by bread alone. Philanthropists, in the presence of the material distress which meets their eye, are often apt to reduce the whole law of almsgiving to the feeding of the body, and to ignore the spiritual side of man's nature, whether in intellect or emotion. They seem fre-

quently to forget that man requires to be sustained in the mind as well as in the body; and hence much narrow dogmatism about the use of wealth.

To endow scientific study or to promote art, is to feed the mind of man, and is sometimes a more urgent duty than the giving of bread. And even more urgent is it at times to contribute to the religious nourishment of man's soul. Human needs are in truth manifold, and the duty of the rich is to use their wealth so that these various needs shall be met as far as wealth will meet them. The narrow philanthropy which would limit the responsibility of wealth to the feeding of the hungry or providing warmth in winter, might easily, by making life meagre, sordid and brutish, do more harm in the long run than the exclusive spending of wealth on artistic enterprise.

But there is one aspect of the question the rich man cannot take too much to heart. His responsibility for the distribution of his wealth is personal. He can never entirely shift the burden from his own shoulders. Nor will it avail, in the day when an account of his stewardship is demanded of him, to say that he appointed agents to do the work for him, if he is wanting in supervising their work. The responsibility is his, and before

God he is answerable for it. Truly does wealth make a man the servant of his fellow-men, "to minister to them in due season!"

Such then are the responsibilities which accrue to the possession of wealth under the Gospel dispensation. Some there are doubtless who would fain reply in the manner of those who first heard our Lord enunciate His doctrine concerning marriage: "If such be the case of a man with his riches, it were better he were not rich." And without any doubt, with many men it were better they were not rich. For when we think of the obligations implied in the possession of this world's goods, it is evident that a man must be particularly unselfish and detached not to fail in some measure in the discharge of his trust. Not that the mere fact of the responsibility justifies a man in casting off the burden of wealth. The abandonment of one's property is justified only when it is a hindrance to the fulfilment of one's proper duty or the following out of one's proper vocation in life. Otherwise, the man who has wealth does better to bear its burden and discharge its duty. Not for leaving all things were the apostles blessed, says St Jerome; but because they left all things to follow Christ. That is the Christian law, and it implies that they

who are called by Christ not to leave all things, but to bear the burden of wealth, shall do this faithfully according to the mind of Christ.

Nevertheless, the Christian does well to bear in mind the temptations peculiarly inherent in the possession of riches. The rich man has the pleasures of the visible world open to him in a measure denied to those who are not rich; and as Cardinal Newman has remarked, worldly possessions are apt "to become practically a substitute in our hearts for that one object to which our supreme devotion is due. They are present; God is unseen. They are the means at hand of effecting what we want: whether God will hear our petitions for those wants is uncertain; or rather, I may say, certain in the negative. Thus they minister to the corrupt inclinations of our nature; they promise and are able to be gods to us, and such gods too as require no service, but like dumb idols, exalt the worshipper, impressing him with a notion of his own power and security. And in this consist their chief and most subtle mischief."* Yes; that is the great danger to which the rich man is exposed —to use his wealth for sense-gratification

* Parochial and Plain Sermons, "The Danger of Riches."

and for the exalting of himself. His possessions are apt to set him upon a pinnacle in his own imagination, and to make him regard the rest of creation as existing for his pleasure or interest. And so he loses the right perception of his relation to God and to his fellow-men; he becomes to himself as another god, and ceases to be amongst men as a fellow-man.

And yet even here a narrow dogmatism may over-reach itself. The rich man undoubtedly has a greater need than the penniless beggar to be on his guard against those self-indulgences which are so easily within his grasp, to exercise greater self-restraint, and to consider his responsibilities for others before he thinks of his own comfort. Only thus will he escape the snare of his wealth. Nevertheless, there is a false asceticism to be avoided by the rich, just as there is a self-indulgence. There is a parsimony in personal expenditure which is morally hurtful, and there is a lavishness which is good. An example of this lavishness was the costly spikenard which the Magdalen poured upon the feet of Jesus as an expression of her gratitude. Had the Magdalen been a poor woman, her tears perhaps would have been her only token; being rich, she added the spikenard to her tears; nor was our Saviour displeased at her lavishness,

though one of the disciples was. Personal expenditure has in truth but one law—it must express the man and bear a direct relation to his vocation in life and to his character. On that basis alone—and on no lesser—is personal expenditure ever justified. Thus a man may rightfully symbolize his affection or esteem for others by gifts in accordance with his means; he may create to himself material surroundings which manifest his sense of the beautiful; and generally he may expend upon himself whatever is necessary for the proper development of a fully human life. But the fully human life has many instincts, and does not live in one groove; it seeks the beautiful as well as the useful; it is in touch with inanimate nature, as well as with human kind. And all these instincts claim expression and are lawful objects for the expenditure of one's money. And indeed in the proper development of his own life does a man best secure a right service of his neighbour: for the greatest help one man can give another is the example of a perfect human life, perfect in its fulness and breadth, as well as in its utter conformity to the mind of God. The man of such a life will not fail in due consideration for others; but will serve them with all the better service for being himself a better

and more perfect man, using his wealth to symbolize and foster noble thoughts and worthy affections wherever he moves. Such is the ultimate responsibility of wealth.

The Idea of Responsibility

If one were called upon to chose a motto which would describe the predominant moral tendency of the day, none better would be found than the almost dying prayer of our divine Lord: "Ut sint omnes unum—that they all may be one." Whether in religious or political or social life the conscience of the peoples is beginning to call aloud, ever more and more beseechingly, for union and unity. The most keenly felt want at the present moment in the religious life of Christendom is that of organic unity; in politics, notwithstanding the individualistic character of modern nations, more thoughtful men are seeking points of agreement and methods of co-operation; in social legislation the freedom-to-starve policy is giving way before the more Catholic principle of collective responsibility. Everywhere a greater sense of dependence one upon another is making itself felt; men are beginning to acknowledge that mere individualism is insufficient as a basis of life, religious, political or social; that the life of one man is always somehow or other the necessary complement of other men's

lives. We are thus getting back once more to the Catholic view of life—a view which manifested itself in the Church of the Catacombs, and still more comprehensively in the Church of the Middle Ages. Yet we must not think for a moment that the individualist movement has been a mere break in the history of the Christian peoples. We can never go back to the exact social and political conditions of the Middle Ages, any more than a man of mature years can regain the exact features and spirit of his youth. We may deplore the violence and lawlessness of of the individualism of the sixteenth century, and its later developments; but we must at the same time remember that the individualist spirit had a certain deep justification as a protest against the despotism of the feudal age. Despots, particularly benevolent despots, may be very useful to a nation in the early days of its existence, but we must always bear in mind that despotism is but an imperfect form of law, and has its natural recoil in lawlessness. The French Revolution followed naturally upon the glorious despotism of Louis XIV. Individualism is, in fact, a necessary factor in the more perfect social economy. A man must have freedom to expand his innate energies; freedom for personal

vigour and personal initiative. To crush out personal initiative and to smother personal energy is to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs of national honour and prosperity.

Catholics, when treating of the social question, are apt to refer with just pride to the days when Catholic charity was an active influence in the social economy of the land. But they sometimes seem to forget that the political and social system of to-day is different from that which ruled the lives of our forefathers; or, if they acknowledge the difference, it is to wish for the return of "the good old days." "The good old days," however, never do return, and cannot. We must clearly recognize the fact that the past is gone, and that we have to deal with the present and the future. We can draw from the Middle Ages many a noble inspiration; but we can never revert to the system, social and political, which they created. That system collapsed with the advent of the new spirit of individualism; nor can it be reconstructed. The individualist spirit is still in our blood, levelling ancient social distinctions and creating new, bringing to men the new sense of personal equality, or at least a repugnance to personal inequality; creating a new labour market and gradually widening the franchise till

every man has a voice in the government of the land. These are some of the results of the individualist movement; and who would wish to go back on them?

No; the latest movement in our social life has no wish to deny its individualist birth, nor to surrender the personal freedom, bought at much suffering, which that birth confers. Those who speak—as some of the exponents of socialism have spoken—of the new social spirit as a denial out and out of individualism are either self-contradictory or sadly wanting in insight. A socialist system, under which the community is everything and the individual nothing, would be a simple reversion to despotism and, without a personal despot, a sheer impossibility. What then is this new social spirit, which to-day is seeking the approbation of religion and the blessing of the Church? In the first instance it is a reaction against the abuse and exclusiveness of individualist right—not against its legitimate claim. It recognizes as necessary in a healthy human society the principle of individual right and personal initiative; but it goes beyond this and recognizes that *right is coincident with responsibility;* and further still, that responsibity is more immediately than right the basis of human society. Rights are the foundation of so-

ciety, the duties resulting from them the walls of the edifice. Hitherto the individualist spirit has endeavoured to construct society more or less simply upon the recognition of individual rights; the new spirit considers rather the responsibilities these rights entail. Laws which recognize merely the rights of men will never cover the whole of society; there are those who for all practical purposes may be said to have no rights—the weak, the helpless, the beggar, the uneducated. Legislation based upon the simple maintenance of rights only renders these a more easy prey to the stronger and the more intelligent: for them, legislation to be effective must be based upon the strong man's duty to the weak, and the intelligent man's duty to the ignorant.

Thus in the new social economy the individual will no longer retain his splendid but almost barbaric isolation; he will be one among many, a free-man among free-men, but still a member of the community. In short, legislation will represent responsibilities as well as rights. A new social unity will in this way grow out of individualism itself, and replace the old social unity of the Middle Ages. That ancient feudal unity of society was, as I have said before, destroyed by the individualist spirit; and

we can never hope to see it again; but a new social unity may be achieved upon the very foundation of individualism. The individualist spirit has brought about political unity; it has now to achieve social unity. It used to consider political unity the only security of individual right; now it begins to see that political unity is not enough; that social unity—the knitting together of the members of the community in the bond of human fellowship—is better and, in fact, necessary if the community is to continue to exist and prosper.

The dominant note, then, of the new social spirit is the sense of responsibility as co-existent with right; and this note is being heard even more clearly in our modern legislation. The laws of the State, after all, do but reflect the conscience of the nation. As long as ultra-individualism represented the moral code of the people, the legislature favoured the strong and proclaimed the individual's rights. But with the growth of a new moral test the character of modern legislation has changed, and it now gives voice to the growing conviction that rights bear responsibilities. But to shift our responsibilities from ourselves personally on to the back of the State, except in cases where State intervention is necessary, as

when a complexity of circumstances paralyses personal effort, is to strike at the very root of social morality by destroying the authority of a man's own conscience. Now this is the great danger we have to face in many of the socialist theories. They are apt to substitute State legislation for personal conscience, instead of making legislation what it ought to be, the handmaid and support of personal conscience. Yet morality proceeds from conscience, not from mere legislation. Slavery is not obedience; coercion is not virtue. Unless a State is built upon the conscience of a people it cannot prosper. The conscience may be faulty and defective, but upon its strength the prosperity of a State depends. England prospered politically under the Commonwealth, because of the intensity of the Puritan conscience—intense though narrow. The Roman Empire fell into ruins because it had lost its conscience. To substitute legislation for conscience, or, what comes to the same thing, to limit personal duty to the observance of positive laws, is to destroy the moral sense and ultimately ruin the State. This is a cardinal truth that cannot be too carefully kept in mind by whosoever puts his hand to the social problem.

It follows then that the primary con-

cern of the social reformer is to arouse in people a conscientious conviction of their personal duty one towards another. Legislation may be a necessary means towards this purpose; it may be necessary in order to strengthen the national conscience or to give effect to its demands. In such cases let us by all means secure legislation, and see that the statute book does not obstruct the conscience of the nation.

There will however be always a large measure of common responsibility outside the sphere of law. This responsibility falls upon the national free-will and upon the conscience of the individual. Nor is it good for a nation that its entire common responsibility be taken over by the executive government, if the highest type of citizen is to be cultivated. Were England's hospitals charged upon the public treasury, instead of being supported by voluntary subscriptions, the result would be a distinct set-back in the moral development of the English people. The more directly the burden of responsibility falls upon the individual citizen, the better it is for the moral character of the State: for national morality depends in its ultimate genesis upon the individual citizen's free-will.

The idea then that an individual's re-

sponsibility for the welfare of the community ends with his discharge of the obligations imposed by law, is one of those fallacies which most surely tend to undermine popular liberties and by reaction bring about State despotism: and despotism whether it be monarchical or republican, is the lowest form of government suitable for nations in their infancy and in their decay.

The more then people recognize the idea of responsibility as the basis of their national existence, the more secure is popular liberty. Liberty is born in the recognition of personal rights; it flourishes in the recognition of personal responsibilities.

For us Catholics the growth of the sense of mutual responsibility and the desire of more effective unity among men, is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. Protestantism grew and flourished in the atmosphere of the ultra-individualism of the past four centuries. The new spirit which manifests itself to-day beckons towards Catholicism. As Protestantism tends ever to disperse the units of society, so Catholicism tends ever to draw them together; as the one fosters selfishness, the other fosters charity.

But how are we Catholics availing ourselves of the opportunity again offered

to the Church? Are we abreast of the nation in the intensity of our conviction of social responsibilities? I should hesitate to say we are not. Yet it may be doubted whether we are doing all we might do to influence the course of national life.

Until the last few years we have kept too much apart from the national life; not altogether through our own fault. Long years of exclusion from political and social life, caused by the penal laws, made us timid, and when first we began to stir, the sense of isolation cramped and depressed us. Happily we are getting rid of this feeling of outlawry and are beginning to take our place amongst our own people. Hitherto we have looked too exclusively to our own interests as apart from the national interests; being driven thereto by the need of self-preservation. Even now we have to be wary in the face of much opposition to Catholic interests. Nevertheless, the time has come for us to enter more boldly into the national life and influence more directly its course, co-operating as far as we can with all agencies, Catholic and non-Catholic, which work for the common good. With this wider interest before us, even our own special interests will benefit; for our energies will gain a new lease of life and put forth still greater power.

The day has gone by when we can justifiably stand apart from the political and social life around us. We have freedom to make ourselves what we ought to be: a force in the nation. It depends upon our own energy whether we become a force. In private life and in association with each other, it is the manifest duty of English-speaking Catholics to-day to put themselves in the van of the social and political movement; and whilst recognizing the lesson of history in regard to the evolution of national life, to bear witness at the same time to the Catholic doctrine of social responsibility.

Part II

Religious Aspects of Social Work*

To keep one's eyes open to the facts of life is in one sense the beginning of wisdom. We cannot close our eyes to the facts without danger of disaster. The facts of a situation may, perhaps, not fit in easily with our preconceived theory of what life ought to be; in that case it is probable that our theory is at fault; too narrow, perhaps, or based upon false premises. So, if it is said—and one does hear it said even yet—that the proper place for a priest is his sacristy, or that the layman has no part in the Catholic apostolate, we at once turn to the world as we see it, and find that these theories do not square with the facts. If the world to-day is influenced by the priest, it is just because he does not confine his spiritual activity within the walls of his sacristy, but, like Christ Himself, goes forth and moves amongst the seething crowd, giving a helping hand wherever he can. Again, if the Church in England has been able to save thousands of homeless children from moral and spiritual death, and if, as is the

* A paper read at the Catholic Conference, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1901.

case, the position of Catholicism is better understood and more respected than it was fifty years ago, is not this due in large part to the work of the laity? Of late years the influence of the layman in religious affairs has enormously increased, both within the Church and without. Amongst ourselves the laity have taken a noteworthy part in placing Catholic dogma before the non-Catholic world and making it intelligible to those not accustomed to Catholic terminology. Still more have they taken up work of a social character in the interests of religion. In doing so it must be admitted that they have but fallen into line with the non-Catholic world.

One of the dominant features of the present age is its effort at social reconstruction. When towards the middle of the last century Disraeli pictured in "Sybil" the miseries and degradation of the working class and the thoughtlessness of the wealthy, the social organism could hardly be said to exist in England. There were various social classes, each unknown to the other, except as passing strangers may be said to know each other. The rich seemed to have no idea of how the poor lived, and the poor judged the rich in bitter ignorance. There was, indeed, some sort of economic system binding the one class to the other; but morally and hu-

manly the rich and the poor formed two nations ignorant of each other's habits, and undesirous of each other's acquaintance. It was the darkness before the dawn. Since then the national conscience has been awakened to the crime of such absolute moral separation. Men have begun to feel that one class has a duty towards the other, and that every man is bound to every other man by some sort of responsible relationship. Men like Cardinal Manning and Lord Shaftesbury have not lived in vain. To-day the moral atmosphere is charged with the sense of social responsibility. It is felt that the poor and the weak have a claim upon the rich and the strong; that to seek one's own interest without any consideration for the interests of those less fortunate is wrong—a sin against God and a crime against the State. This conviction manifests itself partly in economic legislation, partly in individual and voluntary endeavour, to better the condition of the poor and the luckless. But in whatever way it manifests itself, it is well to take note that this conviction of one man's responsibility for another is essentially connected with the growth of religious and Catholic feeling which has been so evident in English life during the last half century. This is a fact which cannot be too well recognized.

Social work in its various forms is a mark of the religious awakening of the age. It springs from religious feeling; it is intimately bound up with a reviving faith. There are some, it is true, apart from the Catholic body, who would deny that their interest in the condition of their fellow-men has any religious basis. "We care for our less fortunate neighbours for their own sake," they will say, "not for God's sake. We are interested in humanity; we have no faith in another world or in any ecclesiastical creed. We want our fellow-men to be happy here; we do not look beyond." Such assertions, however, must not be taken literally. They are oftentimes nothing else than the utterance of a soul which hardly knows itself; which is striving to do the right thing immediately before it; and is impatient of doctrines or theories which as yet it does not understand. In spite of their assertions to the contrary, these people are, more frequently than they know, being drawn to God through the service of their neighbour; they are becoming more unselfish, less self-indulgent, more sympathetic towards others—and why? Because they are under the influence of that divine Spirit which is moving upon the dark waters of their being, to unfold, in due time, the creation of their faith. Some

there are, indeed, amongst social economists, who have set up theories in direct opposition to religion; who directly inculcate a worship of the material and present in opposition to the spiritual and eternal in man; but these are the few, and are chiefly found amongst the theorists. Of those who regard social regeneration from a practical point of view, who are interested more in their fellow-men than in their own theories, it may be said, without reserve, that an interest in the social problem is a sign of an awakened conscience and of reviving religion. St John tells us that "He who loves God, loves also his brother." We may say, too, wherever there is an unselfish love of one's neighbour, there is the Spirit of God. People may think they are working only for humanity; but if their work is inspired by the human sympathy, and not by the spirit of contradiction to existing institutions, the fact is that the Spirit of God is in them, even though they know it not.

I say it is well that we should take note of the religious character which invests the social movement of our time; for it is becoming more and more evident that if the Church is to win the allegiance of the mass of the people, it must be by the application of religious principles to the social problems of the hour. The Church

has never yet gained the multitude by theological argument, but by the manifestly good effects of her teaching upon the condition of their daily life. When the people recognize that wherever the Church has power and influence, their life becomes invested with greater happiness and dignity; when they see that Christianity in practice means justice and a sense of responsibility on the part of the strong or wealthy towards the weak or poor, then and then only are they moved to listen to her teaching. They judge of the teaching by its fruit, as it comes within the scope of their own life. It is all very well for the Church to promise them happiness and freedom from pain in the next world; they want some sort of assurance of the future even in this life. The Church may not be able to take away all suffering and misery, but they demand that life should be made more tolerable than it is as a result of the Christian teaching. And after all, is not this a fair argument? If Christianity is what it professes to be, the law of charity, should it not operate for good upon the selfishness and injustice of the world? should it not gradually take away wrong and lessen misery wherever it is the creed of the community? If it does not do this, then either Christianity itself has no vital power

or its professed disciples are false to their creed. We, who have the faith, know that wherever the Gospel seems to fail, it is because of the faithlessness of those who profess to accept it. But the multitude do not argue thus. With them Christianity is identified with the men and women who profess it; if these fail the Gospel itself is supposed to fail. Can we wonder then, when we remember the intense selfishness which dominated English life, especially in towns and commercial centres for so long a period, that the Christian religion became an object, if not of contempt, at least of indifference, to the mass of the people? The churches were attended on Sundays by the men who, during the week, were sweating the poor or allowing them to live in hovels unfit for human habitation. The supporters of religion were those who let the sick poor die in their misery without a word of comfort or an effort to relieve them. The Christian people, to borrow Russel Lowell's illustration, were they who built fine temples of stone to the Christ, but ignored Christ's "least brethren" as though they were not. How could the mass of the people be expected to think well of Church or gospel under those circumstances? The accusation which was levelled against Christianity with such

force fifty years ago can hardly be held to-day; religion and an interest in one's fellow-men, in great measure, go together. The poor are no longer over-ridden by the rich, nor the weak by the strong, as in a former time.

Yet there lingers amongst the masses a certain antagonism towards religion and churches; an antagonism fostered by certain socialist teachers. And the only way to supplant the antagonism is to make it manifest that the gospel is the gospel of social reorganization and betterment. In this way religion will come to the people as something affecting their present life as well as their future; and, after all, is not that the way in which religion comes to us all when it comes with vital force? It brings with it a certain reconstruction of our present life, and thereby gives us an assurance of the more perfect life to come. If it leaves us pain, it also brings us joy even here, and a foretaste of the joy eternal. So, too, the kingdom of God in eternity must be pre-figured, even on earth, in the influence which Christianity exerts on the condition of the poor and helpless and suffering. This influence is the one potent argument by which the Church can gain the multitude. It has been said that socialism appeals to the people, not merely as an economic sys-

tem, but as an ethical and religious code, and that this fact accounts for the sort of religious enthusiasm with which the socialist doctrines are received. The working man is not won over merely by the socialist's picture of the future millenium in which all men will be equal and provided for, but much more is he drawn by the appeal which is made to his sense of justice, and to that instinct of unselfishness which is deep in the heart of every true man. It is the moral principle as much as the economic which gains his allegiance. Now this being the case there is no reason why the Church should not arouse the same religious enthusiasm amongst the multitude. "Socialism," it has been said, "in its most explicit and absolute form has a great attraction for the masses, by reason of that quality which it possesses in common with the Gospels. . . . It is this factor which has lent to those who profess and propagate it the illusion of an apostolate, and has inspired in those who are its objects an enthusiasm extending to fanaticism."

But if the socialist, by reason of that sense of pitifulness for human misery, which, it is said, he shares with the Gospel, can find a hearing from the masses of the people, why should not the Church? Perhaps it is that for long religion held

itself too much apart from the common daily life of the people; and so the poor, especially in non-Catholic countries, have come to regard formal Christianity as having no message for them. And yet, looking back through the history of the Church, we find that one of the most undoubted claims of Christianity is that it has given to poverty a human dignity; that it has drawn the various classes of society together in bonds of justice and charity; that its influence has been to relieve the oppressed and comfort the sorrowful, and unite the rich and poor, learned and ignorant in fraternal sympathy. We recall the early days so vividly illustrated in "Fabiola"; we think of the labours of such bishops as St Martin of Tours and of the social work accomplished by the monks of St Benedict; we go back in spirit to the days of the Fioretti, when, as Jacques de Vitry wrote, the primitive age of the Church seemed to have returned, and men once more said: "See how those Christians love one another." We think of St Vincent de Paul and his Sisters of Charity. Now, if this has been the history of the Church in the past, why should we not bring our religion to bear upon our social relations now with similar results as in days gone by? There surely is no reason why this should not be so;

and, if authority be invoked, we could have no more definite call to interest ourselves in the social problem than that uttered time after time by the present Sovereign Pontiff. In truth with us Catholics, more than with others, does it lie to give an example of social duty.

In the first place, we have the tradition of the Church behind us, pointing out our duty with no uncertain voice. If there is one truth more distinct than others taught us by Catholic history it is that of the solidarity of the Christian people; that each class in society has a duty of justice and charity towards every other class, and each individual, according to his opportunities, towards every other individual. The doctrine of the Communion of Saints, which to us Catholics is so intimate and precious a belief, has its foundation in this very belief that we are all one family in God, with family responsibilities towards each other; and these responsibilities affect our temporal relations with each other as well as our eternal; our material relations as well as our spiritual. We cannot rightly cut our lives in two; we cannot sincerely talk of spiritual assistance whilst we are content to let a poor wretch lie in a ditch or starve of hunger. There are times when Christian charity and brotherhood finds its most dutiful ex-

pression not in prayer, but in a loaf of bread. It not unfrequently happens that the immediate duty springing from our Christian fellowship lies not in the direction of the Church, but in that of the ballot-box. And we must ever remember that the spiritual works of mercy can never supplant the corporal works. Let us pray for each other, yes; but let us never forget that Christian charity demands that we give the helping hand as well. To us Catholics, then, it is an urgent personal duty, arising out of the fulness of our faith in Jesus Christ and His Church, to exercise, according to our opportunities, and the needs of the hour, the divine charity upon which our lives should be built. "How can you love God if you close your heart to your neighbour?" is in effect the teaching of St John the Apostle. How can you call yourselves Catholics if you fail to recognize the obligations of Christian fellowship?

There is a further reason apart from that of our ordinary duty which should impel us to social activity. We are all anxious, I suppose, that in God's own time our country should receive once more the fulness of the Catholic faith, and be united to the one Fold. But do not let us deceive ourselves, and think that this will be brought to pass by mere

theological argument. The most convincing argument is not that of a speculative nature, but the argument of Catholic life as it manifests itself in action. What then are we Catholics doing to exhibit to the population at large our faith in practice? Are we especially interested in those questions which make for greater morality in the community? Do we make the most of our opportunities—whether in private life or in public—to advance the cause of religious education, temperance, the proper housing of the poor, fair wages and honest labour? Are we doing all that might reasonably be expected of us in the matter of taking part in civic and national responsibilities in the direction of social justice and charity? And again, do we take our proper part in the voluntary efforts which are being made by individuals and by associations to redeem the souls of the very poor from the degradation and misery of the modern slum? Yet this activity is an essential feature in the apostolate, which will bring about the conversion of our country to the Catholic faith. We need theologians to explain the Catholic doctrine; but we need, too, the Catholic social worker to exhibit Catholicism in practice on a question which lies so near the heart of the people at large. The social worker, equally with the theo-

logian, carries on the apostolate; neither can be put aside, but as far as the mass of the people are concerned, the theologian is perhaps in less need immediately than the social worker.

In this paper the word "social worker" is, of course, used in its broadest sense, as including all who take an active interest in the social problem in any of its various moral aspects, and who endeavour to give effect in practice to their convictions. Naturally, different persons will find scope for their energies in different ways: some in a more individual capacity, others as members of associations; some again will fulfil their duty chiefly by participation in civic or public life, others by more private and voluntary endeavour. But all are bound to use the opportunity which comes to them, and so extend the influence of Catholic social activity.

But there is one form of social activity to which I have been asked to make special reference. It is that which is more commonly understood when we speak of "social work," namely, the voluntary effort of persons in their private capacity, either individually or in association, to minister to the needs of their less fortunate fellow creatures. There can be no doubt that the ultimate moral regeneration of society

depends upon every class realizing its obligation to live by right Christian principle. The need of reform is as much amongst the rich and educated classes as amongst the poor; and until these more fortunate classes are converted to the Gospel of Christ, there can be no real social reform. It is the selfishness, worldliness and luxury of the higher classes which in great measure bring about the degradation of the poor. To save the poor, you must needs first save the rich. At the same time, as has been said elsewhere, "the problem of Darkest England will never be solved simply by preaching a high morality to the world at large. The degradation of the poor in England is of too vast a nature for any but heroic measures."* We need an army of workers who shall devote their leisure to the Christ-like task of reclaiming the multitude who have fallen away from religion and any proper standard of human life and dignity, or who are on the downward grade. In other words, there is the vast multitude of human beings who will never raise themselves, but who will ever tend downwards towards a less human condition of life, in which common human respectability, to say nothing of religion,

* "St Francis and You," iii, p. 233.

is lost, unless a helping hand is stretched out to save them and strengthen them. For the want of that helping hand thousands have been lost in utter degradation, and thousands are still being lost. Surely here is an evident duty; and how are we discharging it? For some years past the bishops have been appealing to the Catholic laity to throw themselves into this work of saving the weak and helpless; and societies and clubs have sprung up in most dioceses having this object in view. But it may be doubted whether these societies and clubs are generally supported as they should be by those who have the means and leisure to support them. In some places they flourish, and good work is done; elsewhere they languish, and hardly merit to exist. What is the cause of this?

In the first place, it is due, I believe, to national temperament. Our people do not take easily to organizations and societies, unless these organizations and societies give large scope for individual action. Our temperament is not like that of the French, who delight in organization and committee meeting, and are able to do good work by means thereof. We, on the other hand, are by nature individualistic; we like to feel that we have somewhat of a free hand, even when we work

together, and we only succeed when we feel that we have a free hand. Hence, our organizations must take this national temperament into account, and not bind individuals too closely to any one groove of action; they must inculcate principles of actions rather than regulate details; at least there must be some scope for personal idiosyncracy. As I say, we need to inculcate principles rather than regulate external action. A certain amount of external regulation there must be, if a society is to exist; but amongst us such external regulation must necessarily be reduced to a minimum if we are to succeed. Such is the demand of our temperament. Associations, especially those formed for missionary objects, are always in danger of over-organization; it is a danger to be particularly guarded against in these countries. And because of this national temperament I am inclined to think that the best part of our good work will be done by individuals, acting in their individual capacity. However, as long as the work is done it matters not how it is done—whether by individuals or by organizations; the essential thing is that the work be done at all.

But there is another reason why "social work" languishes amongst us. It is hardly yet realized how urgent is the duty

upon us all to do what we each can to rescue the weak and the degraded. I do not mean to say that there is not much charity amongst us. There is, indeed, a great deal; but it does not always operate in the right direction. It is not sufficient to give the helping hand merely to those who by accident or design come across our path. We need to go out into the highways and byways, and seek those who are in need—that is the charity of Christ, which should be the rule of our own lives. Of course, there are those who have neither leisure nor opportunity to go beyond their own family circle, and who can only help those who come across their path. They fulfil their whole duty in doing what they can within their own circle. But there are others—and they are not a few—who have leisure and are otherwise able to follow Christ in His search for the lost sheep. These surely have a duty to do. To them the voice of Christ speaks bidding them to leave idle gossip or selfish pleasure, and to come, follow Him, and go down into the haunts of vice, ignorance and sorrow to rescue the sheep that are astray. This is the present apostolate to which the many are called who have leisure and opportunity; and it must be in great measure a lay-apostolate. For the layman has oppor-

tunities which are denied to the priest. He comes more constantly into contact with his fellows in their daily life; in many ways he gets to know them better; he speaks their language, and when he speaks, it is with persuasion and not with authority. All this gives him an influence different from that of the priest, and in some ways more effective, at least with the ordinary run of men. And here I would point out how, in this lay-apostolate, the working-man and woman have a distinct mission apart from that of the man of leisure and wealth. If ever the English-speaking working-class is to be brought back to a really Christian life and a sincere belief in Christianity, it will be chiefly through the influence of men and women of their own class—the men and women who live and toil like themselves, and have to bear the burden and heat of the day, and who yet purify and ennoble the workers' life by the example of healthy Christian principle. The greatest need of the hour is to raise and equip this army of Christian workers, who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. The rich and leisured can do much in their own way; but the workman and the work-woman can do even more. I cannot now linger over this suggestion, but will go on to

speak of the conditions under which social work must be done if it is to have any permanent moral and religious value.

In the first place it is useless for anyone to attempt to better the condition of his neighbours unless his own personal life is fashioned on sound social principles. In the apostolate of social work, as in every other apostolate, reform and betterment must begin with oneself. Of what use is it to establish clubs or take part in any effort to brighten and elevate the life of the multitude if one's personal and private action is ruled by selfishness and false principle? For example, would it not be a farce for a man to endow hospitals whilst at the same time he systematically sweats his workman and starves the workman's children? The same principle holds good in every form of social work. It is useless to endeavour to better the lot of the poor and starved unless at the same time he takes care to avoid giving encouragement to conditions which bring about the wretchedness and degradation of the poor. The first requirement of the social worker, therefore, is a high sense of justice and charity as the rule of his own personal action: otherwise, what he builds up with one hand he will destroy with the other. And this sense of justice and charity must

be no vague sentiment, but a practical working principle, leading him to consider whether he himself is as just and thoughtful in his personal dealings with others as he might be, and to take pains to know the effect of his action upon the lives and fortunes of others. Thus, to take an instance: The woman who does social work, or is interested in it, how does she deal with her own dressmaker? Is her first thought to get her dress made as cheaply as possible, without considering whether the cheapest price is a fair price for the labour as well as the material? and is she one of those who are constantly worrying her dressmaker and wanting her dress made at inconveniently short notice? After all, the root of all social evil is personal selfishness and thoughtlessness, and whoever would do really honest social work must begin at home in their own personal life, and take away the selfishness and thoughtlessness of others.

Another condition of honest social work is that it must be founded in sympathy, and undertaken from a sense of duty. It is to be feared that not unfrequently people rush into social work from hardly any other or higher motive than the mere love of excitement. Going amongst the poor and playing the reformer is a new

sensation: so it is eagerly taken up for awhile, and after awhile dropped. No wonder that such people have brought a certain amount of discredit on social work. They went amongst the poor as men go to a zoological garden to enjoy the sensation of distributing biscuit and watching the antics of an inferior creation. When they got bored they returned home, leaving in the minds of "the inferior creation" a sense of injustice and a wholesome contempt for such butterfly reformers. Now, nobody has any right to interfere in the lives of other people except they be moved by genuine sympathy and a sense of human fellowship. The real social worker must be one who is conscious of his moral relationship to his less fortunate fellows, and is convinced that it is his duty to share their burden. He must feel that, in some measure, his fellow man's life is his own life; and that, in giving the helping hand, he is but fulfilling a simple duty of loving his neighbour as himself. There must be no arrogant condescension, no superior pity; but simply the charity of Christ who made Himself one with us all in order to save all. What was the secret of the power of St Vincent de Paul but the great saving sympathy which made him enter into the lives of the poor and unfortunate as though

their life was his own? This sympathy it was which gave him such deep understanding of the needs of the poor and so enabled him to be in very truth their friend and helper. Without this sterling sympathy no permanent good can ever be effected. But where there is sympathy, good will assuredly result. And the good resulting will not be only on the side of those who are helped, but on the side of the helper too. For the work undertaken from sympathy will enlarge the heart and develop the character of the worker; and so he will gain even more than he gives.

Finally, whoever would become a social worker must remember that all good, efficient work is in great measure the result of character, and proceeds from his very soul. The priest who would fulfil his ministry as he ought must cultivate a priestly character and a priestly habit of soul; if he neglect this, he will fail in his work. The same principle applies to the social worker. The ultimate object of all social work is moral and religious regeneration. It is to raise men out of their material, or even brutal, existence into that which is human and spiritual. But what spiritual influence can any man have who neglects his own spiritual life? The social worker, therefore, must be a religious man in the proper sense of the word; he must be one who

takes care of his own soul and who knows how to pray. There is a tendency at the present day to undervalue prayer as part of a man's religious life. There are those who flippantly tell us that "to work is to pray." In one sense that is true, if the work is done in the spirit of prayer, with a sense of dependence on God. But how is this spirit of prayer to be acquired except by separating oneself, from time to time, from the worries and cares of life and bringing oneself into special communion with God? Jesus Christ our Master retired at times from the crowd to pray to His Father in quiet and seclusion. That is the example every social worker must follow if he would do Christ-like work.

We must not forget that all our power for good comes from God, and it is needful not to forget God if we would really benefit our fellow-men. Moreover, the habit of prayer will, more than anything else, prevent the social worker from becoming intolerant and pharisaical, and this is a danger against which every reformer or apostle has to be on his guard. "O Lord, I am not as other men!" is too often written broadly on the faces of your crusaders and reformers. But the true apostle of Christ is as humble and simple of soul as he is patient and steadfast; for

whilst he walks amongst men he walks in the presence of God. To sum up briefly, it is the duty of every Catholic to do his part in bringing about greater justice and charity in the world, whether by economic legislation or by private or voluntary endeavour. This is a universal duty incumbent upon all. But for those who have leisure, or who have opportunity, there is a special apostolate—to redeem those who, whether by their own fault or the fault of others, have fallen from what a man and a Christian ought to be. The voice of Christ calls out for helpers in this work, but whoever would help must come to the work in the spirit of Christ; they must be sincere and consistent in their own lives; they must be sympathetic with those they would help; above all, they must walk constantly in the presence of God, and know how to seek in prayer the strength and guidance necessary for their work.

The Working-Man's Apostolate

I. THE CATHOLIC WORKING-MAN A MISSIONER

We are constantly being told that we live in a missionary age. Whether the majority of us realize the call to duty implied in this fact may be doubted. Indeed, it seems that we are but slowly freeing ourselves from the idea that the exclusive vocation of the Church is to preserve the faith of her own children rather than to propagate the faith amongst those who are not of the fold. The unhappy fact that there is a constant leakage from the Church—so many of our poor drifting away and being lost to sight—is used as an argument by many that our first and last work is to look after our own people. A truer appreciation of the situation would, I think, show that the only ultimate method of preventing the leakage is to convert the multitude of non-Catholics amongst whom our own people dwell. So long as a few Catholics are scattered amongst a large population of non-Catholics, nothing will prevent a large leakage, especially in these busy industrial days. Much, indeed, can be done to tempo-

rarily stay the leakage by clubs and confraternities; but the danger will remain as long as our people are but a handful in a multitude.

Moreover, apart from this consideration, we must remember that the Church is meant for all, and that Jesus Christ has left to us, His disciples, the sacred legacy of "going forth" and bringing all to the knowledge of the truth. Whether from the view to her own preservation or to the fulfilment of the mission left her by our Lord, the Church cannot be indifferent to the multitudes who are not yet within the fold. And in this responsibility we all share, clergy and laity, rich and poor, educated and uneducated; we each have our part to do under the guidance of those who rule the Church. Of this we have, indeed, been frequently admonished during the last few years by the sovereign pontiff and the bishops.

In this paper I propose to deal with this question only in so far as it affects the poor and the labouring classes, who form the bulk of our population. To these the Gospel has to be preached as well as to the educated and the leisured. The working-man and the factory girl have souls as precious in the sight of God as the soul of the millionaire and the university graduate. But the religious pro-

blem as it presents itself to the one is not quite the same as it presents itself to the other, nor is the working-man led to the truth quite in the same way as the man of leisure. The mass of the people, as has been said, judge of the Church by "the manifestly good effect of her teaching upon the condition of their daily life." They will become Catholics when they feel that Catholicism invests their life with greater happiness and dignity; not indeed, taking away all pain and struggle, but nevertheless making pain more endurable, and giving to the struggle to live some assurance of justice and charity and human fellowship. Hence, as has been elsewhere remarked, it is more by her influence upon the social life of the people than by speculative argument that the Church will win the allegiance of the people.*

Now we have here the opportunity of a widely-spread lay-apostolate, and of an apostolate which shall include both rich and poor, the leisured and the working class—in fact an apostolate in which every earnest Catholic might well take part. For it is an apostolate whose success depends essentially upon a right understanding of Christian teaching in

* Religious Aspects of Social Work. Page 127.

its effect on our daily life, and more especially in its effect on our relations with our fellow-men, and upon an honest endeavour to carry this teaching into action.

Perhaps one of the greatest hindrances in the way of the modern apostolate is the notion that all missionary effort must begin with arguments about the one Church and the necessity of entering it at peril of one's salvation, or about the Pope's infallibility and the seven Sacraments. It seems to be frequently forgotten that there is a state of mind to which such doctrines convey no religious significance, but are the mere contentions of a sect; and that to speak of such doctrines is only "to cast pearls before swine." It is like attempting to roof in a house before laying the foundations. And what is the foundation upon which faith is built but a life inspired by a sense of moral principle. To make men better morally, to inspire them with a reverence for moral life, is the first condition of leading them to a knowledge of the Faith. Once you inspire them with a reverence for Christian morals, you have already gone far to win them to a reverence for Christian dogma. But to set the articles of Faith before them whilst they are still strangers to the ethical principles of the Church, is surely to begin at the wrong

end. The key to the Church's dogmatic teaching—so far as we can have a key to it in this life—is principally to be found in her ethical teaching. If men have the key they will soon unlock the treasure. And there is this further to be noticed, that in the moral and social teaching of the Church men most readily find their point of contact with her. For every man who is not utterly brutalized has an instinctive perception of ethical beauty, and will admire justice, unselfishness, purity and meekness, and the other ethical qualities of a Christian life, even when he fails to possess them himself. In every man not utterly demoralized the *anima naturaliter Christiana* exists and becomes conscious of its proper character in the presence of Christian virtue.

Before we begin, then, to expound the doctrines of the seven Sacraments and of the unity of the Church, it is necessary that we attract the people by the sublimity of the Church's teaching in regard to what is visible in daily life, and then lead them to connect this ethical teaching with the articles of our Faith which alone give reason and vitality to Catholic morals. They will thus be drawn naturally to seek the Faith, the fruits of which are already admirable in their sight.

The question now is: how are we to

bring this moral and social teaching of Catholicism home to them? I repeat, I am considering now the vast multitudes who have but little leisure for speculative argument—the workers to whom life is so terribly practical. It can only be done when the Church presents to the world the example of devoted men and women chosen from the working class itself, who, by their deeds even more than by their words, shall leaven the multitude and lead them to Jesus Christ. This army of Christ must come, as I say, from the working class; in the first place, because the Gospel is always preached most successfully by the living example; and again, because the poor understand the poor, and because constant personal presence is necessary to successful apostolate. The social worker who brings culture and refinement into the midst of the poor can do much to help them in the struggle of life; but the greatest help of all, the example of the living man: that must come from the poor themselves.

I doubt whether in our efforts to ameliorate the lot of the poor we take sufficiently into account the good which is done by the poor themselves acting as apostles amongst the poor. Not that I in any way underrate the most necessary and useful work done by social workers

of the leisured and educated class. They do a work which none but themselves can do. The maintenance and supervision of educational centres and clubs, the visiting of the sick, rescue-work in its various forms—all this is needful. The very contact of east and west brought about by such workers is productive of good both to the helper and those who are helped. It frequently brings a vision of culture and refinement into the midst of squalor, and who can tell how much moral good is done even by such a flitting vision when the culture is conjoined with sympathy and good-will? And the man or woman of leisure, are they not benefited by contact with the grim realities of poverty and labour? If they are not benefited, it is owing to a moral defect somewhere in their own character.

The personal service of the poor and luckless, represented by social unions and settlements and clubs, or by membership of charity organizations, and not least by private visiting, is a religious duty which the leisured owe to their poor neighbours, and in its own way helps to raise the general moral tone of the multitude, and so prepares the way for religion.

Nevertheless, it is true that the working class and the poor will be saved in the last resort by themselves; by the influence

and apostolate of men and women who themselves are poor and live by the labour of their hands. It is their example and influence more than any other which will leaven the mass. Hence it is that one of the supreme needs of the Church to-day is an apostolate of earnest men and women of the working class who, imbued by a true Christian spirit, will uncompromisingly do battle for their faith, not indeed by easy controversy about doctrines—though in its own time and place such controversy may be useful—but rather by the more difficult argument of a life inspired by faith and hope and firm in its application of the gospel to the common acts of daily existence—a life which will reflect in action the working of Christian moral principle, especially at those very points where the application of Christian principle is most frequently wanting. Such an army of practical Christian workingmen and women would be the very salt of democracy, and without it democracy will hardly be saved.

One of the primary objects of social work therefore should be to raise up such an army. The aim of our work should be not merely to protect the working-man and woman from the ill effects of their surroundings by gathering them into clubs and social meetings, with the purpose of

saving them from the public-house or the street-corner; though such protective work is in itself invaluable. But we need to go further and seek to build up the lives and characters of our Catholic working class upon a broad basis, which will enable them to react upon their surroundings, and themselves better their conditions. For many of the working class the utmost that can be done is to shield them as far as possible from the evils of their condition: but there are many, too, who have in them the character and force of will which would enable them to form an efficient social force were they given a consistent lead, and made to feel that they were entrusted with the responsibility of giving effect to the teaching of the Church in social life.

II. CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL TO THE WORKINGMAN'S APOSTOLATE

But the first condition in the formation of such an apostolate is that these workers must be men fully alive to the actual economic situation as it affects their own class. This is an essential condition of success; for how can anyone influence his fellows unless he have the sympathy born of a knowledge of their circumstances? A sympathy founded on mere emotion or the result of vague general

principles, however legitimate in itself, is not the power that has vital influence over other people's lives. Hence a knowledge of the actual social position of the working class, both in its economic aspect and its moral, is necessarily to be fostered if any good work is to be done. This fact has been well recognized abroad by the Catholic associations which are combating Socialism by working to raise the status of the working class and by forming what we might call a social conscience in the nation. In these associations we find the moral and economic questions of the hour treated of and discussed, so that the members of the associations are well coached in all matters affecting the social situation. In France even so spiritual a society as the Third Order of St Francis has its circles for the study of the Social question. The simple fact is that you cannot apply remedies to an evil you do not understand. Vague platitudes about justice and charity are no argument against the Socialist appeal. The Catholic working-man who for his own self-interest lends himself to a system which by general consent is harmful physically or morally to the worker is but an example of un-Christian selfishness. Again, if he separates himself from the general movement which makes for fair play and more hu-

man relationship between employers and employed, he certainly places himself out of court with his fellow-men, and has no claim to be heard in their councils. He shows himself to be either a self-seeker or a moral drone, or perhaps an idealist who has lost his footing on the solid earth. Such men are not the sort who will influence the world for good or bring the masses to religion. Practical sympathy born of knowledge is the first condition of a successful apostolate. There is unfortunately too much of a tendency amongst religious people to ignore the economic and the practical side of life upon earth, forgetting that the economic is intimately bound up with the moral. John Ruskin has told us that the moral character of a nation is manifested in its architecture; that a people really truthful and sincere will not be satisfied with cheap, showy ornament nor with shoddy houses. We may say with even greater truth that the persistence of an economic system which results in unnecessary hardships to the majority of the nation, whilst the few derive inordinate profits, is the manifestation of a false national conscience concerning commerce and labour; and to correct this false conscience it is necessary to have a knowledge of true economic prin-

ciples and of the actual situation. Otherwise one does but ignorantly foster by indirect means the very moral evils which he would remedy and which are more or less intimately bound up with a false political economy or with ignorance of the effect this has on the people's lives. So, too, in regard to such matters as education and marriage—some knowledge of the actual problems surrounding these questions is absolutely needed. It is all very well to declaim generally against undenominational education; but how many who do this really know the results of such education or have any notion how the practical difficulties of the situation had best be met? May we not ascribe much of the apathy shown even by Catholics in this matter to a want of such knowledge? And as regards the marriage question, perhaps the most serious we have to face in the near future, how many even think of it in the various issues of that difficult subject? The growing number of divorce cases and of the voluntary separations of husbands and wives points to an evil having widespread roots in society. What are the roots of the evil? Where do they lie? Until we get at the roots of the evil we shall never prevail against the divorce court and the unhappy family. Thus a

knowledge of the actual situation is essential to any successful result.

This does not mean that every man and woman need be an expert in political economy, or capable of expounding to an audience the genesis of social wrongs; but it does mean that there must be a generally diffused knowledge of these questions amongst the body of Catholic working-men if we are to direct our energies in the right direction and with due effect. The Catholic working-man should therefore be encouraged to take an intelligent interest in all that concerns the welfare of the working multitude. He should not leave it to his Socialist partner to understand the bearings of the economic system, or even to point out the injustices which spring from such a system. No; the apostle of Christ, even as the Socialist, must know the world he lives in, else he will but beat the air.

Moreover, it is essential to this apostolate that it be the vocation of men and women conscious at once of their proper rights as well as of their duties. Unless men are conscious of their rights, they will never realize their duties nor truly respect themselves. Self-respect implies a consciousness of responsibility; but the sense of responsibility is impossible without a perception of one's rights. The

slave has no sense of duty because he has no sense of freedom. Perhaps no greater harm has been done to religion than by the notion which seems to be widely prevalent that Christianity, or at least Catholicism, fosters the sense of duty at the expense of a sense of one's rights. Catholicism does nothing of the kind, for the simple reason that there can be no duty except in conjunction with personal right. If a man has duties to perform, it is implied that he has rights which he may lawfully claim. Nay, there are some rights which he may not surrender. As Pope Leo XIII has laid down in his encyclical, *Rerum novarum*, a man is bound in conscience to claim those rights which belong to the development of his soul and mind. He may lawfully surrender nothing that is necessary for the preservation and fostering of human dignity. "No man," says the Pope, "may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats with reverence, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; no man has in this matter power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude,

for it is not men's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, the most sacred and inviolable of all rights." A deep sense of his right as a man and a Christian is therefore to be fostered as a duty; for to repeat the Pope's words, "it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God," to whom every man is accountable for the proper development of his being.

But whilst there are some who seem to think that men have no duties and no rights, there are, perhaps, many more who hold that men have rights and no duties. Perhaps some of these would be less urgent in setting forth their rights did they stop to think that every right has its corresponding responsibility, and that a man's dignity is derived even more from the acceptance of responsibility than from the assertion of his rights. In every right there lies a concomitant duty. If a man, for example, obtains a living wage, he is bound to put it to useful and honest purposes, supporting those dependent upon him and providing, if possible, against future want. If he gains shorter hours his leisure may not be spent in idleness, or, worse still, in wrong-doing, but in healthy exercises for soul and body. The man who spends his leisure hours in the public-house or in

other profitless fashion takes away the very justification of a right to leisure hours.

In truth the greatest evil which threatens democracy is the absence of the sense of responsibility, without which no man can live either a Christian or a human life. The mere assertion of one's rights without a fulfilment of one's duties only demoralizes; in such assertion lies the root of all social selfishness, and consequently of all social evil. What the world needs are men and women who, to a sense of their rights, conjoin a keen instinct of duty; who, whilst they will not forget what is due to themselves, are yet more solicitous about what they owe to others.

Now it is in deepening—or perhaps it should be said in awakening—this sense of responsibility, that the chief task of the Church lies. She has, indeed, to guard the rights of men; she must ever foster a consciousness of rights if she would have men maintain their proper dignity; but whilst men are eager to claim and even to discover what belongs to them of right, they are not so swift to recognize their duties: hence the difficulty.

III. DUTIES OF THE CHRISTIAN WORKING-MAN AT THE PRESENT TIME

We come then to the question: What, broadly speaking, are the duties of a working-man and working-woman which call for special attention at the present time? In answering this question we shall arrive at the qualifications of the working-man's apostolate. For he will be a true apostle of Christ who in his life gives a manifest instance of what the Christian working-man should be.

We may conveniently classify his duties under the old theological distinction of duties he owes to God, his neighbour and himself.

To begin with the duties a man owes himself, there is before all else the duty of self-respect. No man can expect to be held in honour by his fellow-men unless he holds himself in honour and acts, speaks and thinks as a self-respecting man should. The man whose dress, or gait, or speech proves him to have lost self-reverence can hardly claim that other men should respect him. Every man, in large measure, creates the esteem in which he is held by the respect in which he holds himself. The man who will condescend to a mean or vulgar trick, by that very disposition of

mind dethrones himself from his rightful place in the esteem of others. Now, it is but an elementary principle of morality that no man can without sin dehumanize himself in even the least degree; he is bound by every law of his being to maintain his proper human dignity. Hence it is that slovenliness is wrong, even when it implies no injury to others; so, too, is intemperance, or any other vice which vitiates human character and puts the man on the road to being a brute. In the grosser forms in which the want of respect for oneself manifests itself, as in intemperance or lying, the evil is quickly recognized; but all want of self-respect is but a question of degree; nor can you ever be sure that the sloven will not develop into a drunkard, given the occasion or the temptation. For this reason every man ought to foster self-reverence as a primary law of his well-being, nor ought he to submit to any conditions which of their nature tend to degrade him beneath the level of self-respecting men. Hence personal cleanliness and a sweet-smelling house, as being manifestations of the respect in which a man holds himself, have a moral quality. So, too, does the thrift which enables a man to avoid the indignity of being necessarily dependent upon others.

Then again, every man, of whatever

position in life, is bound to cultivate his moral and spiritual character. No man is truly human who falls short of that moral and spiritual standard by which God Himself measures us. People sometimes speak of "the human" and "the spiritual" as though the terms represented two antagonistic forces: as though to speak of a man being spiritual is by implication to deny that he is human. Whereas, in fact, the spiritual man is most perfectly human. The antithesis of spirituality is not humanity but brutality; and in so far as a man fails to acquire a proper spiritual standard he is less than human and approximates to the mere brute. So that the cultivation of our spiritual faculties, of the intellect and the moral sense is a primary duty which every man owes himself and the God who made him. Here it is well to guard against a misrepresentation. To cultivate one's intellect is a duty; but this does not mean that a man is bound to investigate all knowledge or learn all sciences; indeed we know that there is a vain and useless knowledge which does harm. The knowledge a man is bound in duty to acquire is limited by his calling and position in life. Moreover, a man's ultimate perfection may be said to reside in character; but every man's character is influenced by his intellectual outlook. Now, it is not so much

learning, but rather intelligence that affects character. Learning indirectly may exercise influence, either by warping the intellect, as frequently happens with those who study one branch of science to the exclusion of all others, or by enlarging one's mental view and accustoming the mind to rise above mere petty detail. In either way, for good or for evil, actual knowledge of things may influence character. The duty of cultivating one's intellect as an element in proper human life is therefore limited, not only by one's vocation or position, but also by individual character. Some there are whose moral power needs to be strengthened by intellectual exercise; whilst others have naturally a clear, intelligent outlook upon life which seems hardly to profit by any special study. The only general rule one can therefore lay down is that ignorance which dehumanizes a man, or lessens the exercise of his moral power, or prevents the development of his proper character, is an evil which it is one's duty to take away by the due exercise of one's mental faculties, and that every man is bound in duty to acquire such positive knowledge as fits him to fill the position which falls to his lot.

The cultivation of the moral sense is of even greater urgency. The moral sense is easily lost amidst the conditions of society

such as we now live in. The whirl, the excitement, and the nervous tension of our present life tend by reaction to produce a certain moral indolence, an impatience of moral restraint, and an abandonment to sense-pleasure which is destructive of the moral faculty. In the struggle for life against all forms of self-interest it is no doubt difficult to foster an unselfish spirit; in a world where each man has to fend for himself it requires no little courage even to think of doing by one's neighbour as one would be done by. It is far easier to reverse the principle and do by your neighbour as he does by you. One has to elbow one's way through a crowd—or be elbowed; wherefore, each man for himself! And so moral principle is thrown to the wind. The tendency of the crowd is to brutalize; and it is becoming more and more difficult under present conditions of existence to avoid the crowd. For this reason in particular it is needful to fix well in one's mind those primary principles of conduct by which the sincere Christian must ever shape his life—the principles, in short, of the Eight Beatitudes. "Blessed are the poor in spirit"—who do not enslave themselves to the greed of temporal goods and luxuries. "Blessed are the clean of heart," "Blessed are the meek," "Blessed are they who suffer for justice'

sake," and so on—a difficult code to live by in the crowd, and yet the law of life given by Him whom we call our Master and Lord. But professions of faith are apt to be taken rather lightly in these days. How many who profess general belief in the Gospel would think of taking the beatitudes quite seriously in daily life? There is a feeling that the beatitudes and practical life do not run well together, that the "poor in spirit" are all very well in hymns but quite out of place in the programme of daily work. It is not merely that men fail in an attempt to act upon the teaching of the beatitudes, but that they do not seriously consider the matter at all, though they would feel insulted were they denied the title of "Christian." Now the want of seriousness which makes this tone of mind points to a fundamental degeneracy in moral character. The very basis of all moral character is sincerity. The man who is loyal in heart to the truth as he perceives it, who scorns to profess loyalty to a doctrine of the truth of which he is not convinced, and who, at the same time, keeps an open eye to perceive the truth, such a man has in himself the foundation of a moral hero. But the insincere man, in proportion to his insincerity, is always at heart immoral. His very virtues are either an hypocrisy or a mere acquies-

cence in the respectable. One cannot, therefore, give too much thought to the fostering of a sincere soul. Where there is sincerity one may hope to find in time the perfect moral character, for sincerity is the root of all perfect character. Hence the perfect Christian must necessarily have all the qualities which belong to sincerity of soul; he must be truthful, open-minded, loyal, a man whose word his neighbours can trust, and whose example they know to be honest. He may fail at times as most men fail in the upward endeavour to do the right; but his failure will be as the fall of Peter, not as the betrayal of Judas. Upon the foundation of sincerity and truthfulness the perfect man is built; let us not forget that, when we set out to build up the religious man. And if this is true of all men in any station of life, it needs especially to be borne in mind by the working-man, the conditions of whose daily life frequently tend to foster a disregard for absolute truth and candour with a consequent deterioration of the moral character.

It is impossible to speak of the duty every man owes himself without referring to that curse of the working class—intemperance. Not that intemperance is exclusively a working-man's sin; but with him it is perhaps, more than any other folly,

the cause of misery. There are those who see in total abstinence from alcoholic drink the only sure remedy for the evil. Doubtless there are circumstances in which total abstinence may be a duty not only for the drunkard but for his neighbours, who are bound in charity to save him from his temptation. Total abstinence, however, is an extreme remedy, not to be insisted on as a general law. But strict temperance, the moderate use of stimulants according to one's need and the avoidance of drink for drink's sake, is but the ordinary moral law, binding on every man, and certainly to be demanded of every self-respecting man. The temperance question is, after all, but the question of how to induce men to be temperate and how to shield the weak from the temptations to drink which beset them. It can only be finally solved by every man's application to himself of the laws of temperance and charity. But the root of the remedy lies in a more strict adherence to the rule of moderation by the man who is not a drunkard. Right adherence to this rule is among the most essential conditions of the working-man's apostolate.

When we come to consider the duties a working-man owes his neighbour, we are at once brought face to face with two urgent questions of the hour—the "home"

question and the question of a man's relationship with his fellow-workers. The moral life of a people can be measured with fair exactitude by the reverence in which they hold marriage and domestic life. A people which looks upon the marriage vow as sacred, and casts a halo of sanctity around the relations of husband and wife, and of parent and child, is almost sure to be morally sound. Any loosening of this relationship is an infallible symptom of moral decay. None can look out upon the present world and not feel some anxiety at the growing want of reverence in which marriage is held, as though it were a merely civil contract entered into for some temporary advantage or present self-interest. The evidence of this is seen not merely in the divorce courts, but in the lack of domestic sentiment which, where it is found, makes the home a veritable sanctuary of the human affections and the mainstay of a high moral life. And in truth the home, in which husband and wife, parent and child, find the common centre of their thoughts, is the inner sanctuary of all social life. Our present life, with its rush of business and whirl of excitement, has necessarily affected the life of the home; the family is more frequently separated than formerly; there is not the same constant presence of each

to each in the home of the commercial town as in the country village. Then, again, our multitudinous opportunities for pleasure and excitement naturally act as a dissolving element in the family. And more powerful than all these influences is the individualism of temper and inclination which present social conditions have developed. It is easy to denounce the circumstances in which a man lives, and men are apt to lay disproportionate blame for their sins upon their circumstances; but, after all, a man is most a man when he fights against the circumstances which threaten him. We cannot help the rise of commercial centres nor the tendency to seek the larger life outside the home; nor are these things in themselves unmixed evils. One can stay too much at home, and be the less of a man for doing so. But what every man can do, and is bound in duty to do, is to cultivate a proper sense of his responsibilities towards those with whose life his own is most intimately bound up. The Christian idea of marriage is that man and wife are to be each other's helpmates along the road of life—helpmates in the spiritual and moral world as well as in the material. It is the husband's duty not only to provide a shelter and food for his wife, but to assist her in the saving of her soul. And the wife's duty, above all

else, is to act as a moral and spiritual influence upon her husband. Before God their lives are intimately bound together, nor can the one ever lawfully seek merely personal interest altogether apart from the other. The indissolubility of marriage means more than continuance of the legal bond: it implies that the two lives are to be constantly lived in moral and spiritual communion with each other, "even as Christ and the Church."

In the recognition of this sacred truth lies the only remedy for the dissolving process through which the idea of marriage is now passing. Hence the most urgent social duty of the working man is to foster within his own home this high ideal of Christian marriage, and to invest his home with some of the reverence and devotion with which he regards the Church. It should be his joy, as well as his duty, to make his dwelling, however humble, exhibit something of the reverence and honour of the sacramental life which is lived in it. A dirty, ill-kept house is surely not the fitting environment of Christian married life, but rather a blasphemy against so sacred a relationship. Every Christian man's house by its orderliness and cleanliness should manifest the care which husband and wife have for each other. Yet how often do

we find that the home is neglected, starved, and ill provided-for, whilst money is lavishly spent upon personal dress or personal luxuries! In these things we witness the selfishness which is really at the root of so much domestic unhappiness and disunion. Instead of thinking of each other, husband and wife are wrapped up in their own separate personality, and so whilst legally united they become morally separated, each living their own inner life apart from the other.

What is said of the relationship between husband and wife may be said to a large extent of the tie which binds parents and children. This relationship, too, has its moral and spiritual aspect; it is not the mere animal bond of the beast to its offspring. The parent has a priestly duty towards his child, to foster his moral and spiritual nature, and to neglect this is to fail in the exercise of the most sacred function of fatherhood. The child, on the other hand, is bound by every law of nature to assist the parent as well as he can when the parent comes to need assistance; and at all times to give the parent that love which is a parent's best support in life. Yet the tendency is for children to cast off their filial sentiments once they are able to fend for themselves, and to leave the parents to themselves, as

though the bond were severed with the child's ability to take up his own life. And so with the dawn of the years, when the character is most subtly formed by one's relationships with other people, the sense of loyalty and reverence is lost, without which no man can rise to the best that human nature can achieve. Very true is it that the foundation of society is the family, and that the heart of the nation is the home. Destroy the dignity and sacredness of those primitive relationships, and no society can maintain itself morally or materially.

The other pivot upon which the working-man's responsibility for others turns may be said to lie in his relations with his fellow-workmen. The working-man today is fast merging his individual self in the membership of a vast association; circumstances have forced him to combine with others of his own trade and class. Employers have to deal to a large extent not with individual workmen, but with trades unions. And even when a man does not belong to a trades union, he yet frequently feels a sort of moral obligation to stand by those who, like himself, have to earn their bread. The instinct of self-preservation has compelled men, if they would hold their own, to combine.

Now, next to the responsibilities of

domestic life, nothing perhaps shapes the working-man's character more radically than does this fact of his being consciously a unit in the working class. It has given him undoubtedly a greater independence of character and a greater self-respect; it has tended to bring about more human conditions of existence for a large number; it has in great measure abolished the white slavery of commercialism. No greater evil could befall the working class than to sink back into that helpless individualism from which the trades unions have delivered them. At the same time it is increasingly manifest that this right of combination, like all other rights, may become an evident wrong, unless it is taken in conjunction with its responsibilities, and unless its limitations are recognized. No class of men has any right to combine to work injustice; and if men claim rights, they must also at the same time assume the duties which accrue from these rights. A working-man's combination has for its lawful object the securing of a just wage and reasonable hours of labour or other human conditions for the labourer. It can never lawfully use its power against the rights and fair consideration due to the employers; nor can any member of the union in conscience act with the union when such aggression is

manifest. Moreover, just as the individual man is in duty bound to cultivate as far as in him lies good-will and friendly relations with his employer, so is every union responsible for any failure on its part to foster and maintain the same good relations. The legitimate object of every combination is in the first place to obtain justice for its members; but in combining together men never escape the larger relationships of life which bind them to cultivate universal charity. The Catholic working-man, therefore, has this twofold duty. On the one hand he ought loyally to stand by his fellow-workmen in whatever affects their human condition, resisting with them any injustice which tends to lower their human dignity and proper self-respect. Thus he should never willingly accept a manifestly unjust wage, if his acceptance would be taken as a precedent in the case of others. And generally speaking, he should loyally stand by the action of his union or class so long as the object aimed at is necessary for the general welfare of his fellow-workers. Any other course would be gross selfishness, unworthy of a Christian. Nevertheless, he must have the courage to dissociate himself from any action which he knows to be an injustice towards other classes; and what is of still more practical

urgency, he should ever seek to make his influence felt in the cause of honesty and good-will. One of the moral dangers arising from a union is that individuals, realizing their power in combination and that the union will be sure to stand by them in case of conflict with an employer, are apt to turn out idle and profitless servants, taking good wages but giving bad work. Unfortunately trade unionism has been made to bear no little of the obloquy attaching to dishonest members. Yet if the union assumes the power of enforcing the rights of its members, it must in common honesty take all reasonable precautions to see that the members fulfil their duties. Any union which fails to do this is inherently immoral: for to dissociate duties from rights is always immoral. Hence the Catholic member of a union is in conscience bound to bring his own personal influence to bear upon the action of the union in enforcing common honesty upon those who claim its protection. Nor do I see how any Catholic can be a member of a union which persistently ignores this duty. Fair wage implies fair labour; and no one, either individually or in combination, can claim a fair wage unless he is prepared to give equally fair labour. To act otherwise is to renounce every claim to honesty.

And now for the duties the workingman owes to God. Every duty rests of course in its ultimate source upon the divine will manifested either in the order of nature or of grace. If a man is bound to respect himself it is in the last resort because God so wills it. Man is not his own master absolutely; he must live the life his Creator has given him, subject to the divine law of life. He cannot dispose of himself except subject to the divine law. And so every duty is at least indirectly an obligation due to God. When, then, we speak of the duties man owes to God as apart from the duties he owes his neighbour and himself, we mean those direct duties which spring from man's personal relationship with God and which constitute religion in the technical sense of the term. No man can serve God who does not respect himself and serve his neighbour; but the service of God implies a worship which goes beyond oneself and one's neighbour. God has a distinct claim of His own upon us, resting not upon any consideration due to man, individually or socially, but upon His own relationship to the world He has created and redeemed. The world is His by supremest right; and so is every individual creature in it. And if each man's own personal life takes in all

the relationships which bind him to his fellow-creatures, it surely remains strangely incomplete when it fails to realize the highest and most intimate relationship of all, that which binds it to the divine life. Yet this is the very relationship most completely ignored at the present time by the vast majority of men. Even amongst those who recognize in their duties towards their own person and towards society a divine sanction, there is a widespread ignorance and even denial of the service due to God apart from His creation. "To serve man is to serve God" is a formula dangerously abused by many a present-day philanthropist. True as it is, if it is meant to imply that you cannot rightly serve God whilst you ignore your neighbour, it is yet mischievously false when it implies that God has no claim upon our homage apart from our neighbour. He has a personal claim upon us simply as God, and He has a direct claim upon every individual apart from that individual's relationship to society. There is a sense in which each individual must say, God and I stand alone. There is a homage which must be given immediately to God.

Undoubtedly the direst evil which has befallen the working class is the widespread ignorance or denial of this imme-

diate relationship of man with his Creator; or, in other words, the loss of religion. The fact is too evident to need proof, that the working class has, to a large extent, lost religious faith. How small a proportion of working-men in any commercial centre attend any church or place of worship, or even bend the knee in private prayer! And yet, notwithstanding this, I belive the religious sentiment is more widely spread than is frequently imagined. Faith is wanting; but in the heart of the people there yet remains something of the religious sentiment, a smouldering fire which has yet to be enkindled into the flame of definite belief. And here lies the supreme need of the Catholic working-man's apostolate. His privilege and vocation it is to bring into the lives of his fellow-men the sacred spark of divine truth, and to excite in them a yearning for that divine faith without which their lives must ever be incomplete and wanting in spiritual reality. But how is he to accomplish this? In the first instance assuredly by example. His life must be such as to win the respect of His neighbours for the faith which is in him. Only then can he attempt to expound his faith to them without fear of bringing shame upon it. For men judge of a man's religion not so much

by his words as by his life. But the man whose faith shines forth in his actions is the man of strong faith, one to whom religion is the most pressing concern of his own life, whose chief anxiety in life is to know and love God. And of how many a Catholic working-man can it be honestly asserted that he is such? Is it not more generally the rule that religion is but a secondary consideration, a compromise between God and the world, between one's eternal interests and mere transitory pleasure? And how can such men as this be the shining light which is to draw men to the Faith? Truly has it been said that the indifferent and worldly-minded Catholic is the greatest obstacle in the path of the soul seeking the Faith. "If these are the products of Catholicism," runs the argument, "there is little to be gained by seeking God there." The argument may not be logical, but it is highly pardonable.

It has been remarked that the tendency of religious people at the present time is to develop philanthropic and social ideals at the expense of a knowledge of God and the spiritual life. There is undoubtedly a sting in the remark, which would not be did it not touch a weak spot in the enthusiasm of many social workers. Their failure lies in the unconscious appli-

cation, in the mischievous sense already alluded to, of the principle "To serve one's neighbour is to serve God." Now that is a danger the Catholic cannot too carefully guard against. Whilst he studiously interests himself in the welfare of the social body and gives careful thought to the duties he owes his neighbour, he must not forget that religion implies something more—the cultivation of the spirit of faith and the fostering of that devotion which links a man's present life to his eternal destiny and gives him a spiritual vision and understanding without which there is no religion. Hence the man who would fulfil his vocation as a Catholic and an apostle of Christ amongst his fellow-men must be one who gives some part of his day to sincere and devout prayer; who is alive to the tremendous mysteries of the altar; who values the Sacraments of the Church, and who is accustomed to look out on the events of life with the eye of faith and with trust in the providence of God. He must be one to whom Christ is a living presence, and who without effort can turn to the saints in heaven for example and intercession. Only such a man can do Christ's work amongst his fellow-men. Therefore it is that whilst we insist upon the duties a man owes himself and his neighbours, we must never let it be

thought that his duties end with these: there are yet the still more intimate duties he owes to God Himself; and only when one realizes this triple sense of responsibility is he capable of doing his part in the redemption of the world.

But given such men amongst us—silent men, for the most part, whose lives are visible to the angels more than to their fellows—what a power such must be for the God-given task of bringing men back to Christ! And might there not be more such men if greater effort were made to foster them? Much of our weakness lies in divorcing from each other the various lines of a man's responsibility and forgetting to develop the sense of duty in one respect whilst fostering it in another. And thus there is created a fundamental weakness of character which cannot but prove a source of failure. Too frequently men are allowed to limit their sense of responsibility by what we may call religious duty in the stricter sense; or again, their sense of social duty is developed at the expense of the religious sense; or again, whilst men are taught to fulfil their duties, religious and social, they are not required to take such account of their personal dignity and self-respect as man properly should. And so there remain an incompleteness and narrowness of

character; and who has yet to learn that narrowness and incompleteness of character is the pitfall of missionary labour?

We have attempted to describe the personal conditions necessary for the working-man's effective apostolate amongst his fellow working-men. Now let us turn to his opportunities. His influence must of necessity be chiefly an influence of character. He will help to raise the moral standard of his fellows by the silent power of his own high standard; he will create in them a respect for his faith by the elevating power of that faith in his own personal life; he will win them to the faith when they recognize that the faith has made him a nobler human being than themselves. But, whilst the secret of his power to work good lies in his own personal conduct and character, and though he works chiefly upon others by the silent influence of his own life, yet there are occasions when he must in simple charity depart from the ordinary routine of life to bring into the lives of the people something of that faith which is in himself. For the apostle of Christ must not be content to save his own soul; he must try to save the souls of others and establish the kingdom of Christ in the hearts of many. And if he seeks opportunities he will find them wherever there is a fellow-man in

sorrow or in doubt. When our divine Saviour began His missionary life He announced Himself as sent "to preach the gospel to the poor; to heal the contrite of heart; to preach deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised.* In other words, the ground in which the gospel seed was to be sown was wherever sorrow or misery or pain held sway. Or as He Himself put it on another occasion, He came to those who were sick—that is, to the sick of soul or body. Amongst these, too, lies the most fruitful field of the apostle. And assuredly the working-man has not far to go to find them. When St Francis of Assisi established his Third Order of Penance, that wonderful brotherhood which worked marvels in the thirteenth century, he laid it as a special obligation upon the members that they should make themselves the willing servants of the lepers and of all in direst need. They were, in a word, to diffuse the charity of Christ around them, and it was thus chiefly that they revived the drooping spirit of Christendom. The same principle holds good to-day. We need to exercise the charity of Christ in order to win the world to Christ. Now

* Luke iv, 18, 19.

the working-man can do this amongst his fellow working-men in numberless ways closed to the man of another class. He can help the poor when the helping hand of the rich would be refused. He understands, as only a working-man can, the temptations and weaknesses of those of his own position; he knows where hardship is most felt, and where danger lurks most insidiously. He knows, too, what is often hidden from others, the good points in characters apparently insensitive to the refined aspects of life. In this knowledge of his own class the working-man has his opportunity and one of the principal instruments of his power. With this knowledge he more than others can come to the aid of his fellow-man in need, and can give that neighbourly service which is of the very essence of Christian life. And this is to be well marked, that next to personal probity the readiness to give direct personal service to those who are in need, corporally or spiritually, is the special requirement of the apostolate. The apostolate, begun in the building up of one's own character, must issue in good works on behalf of one's neighbour. How many a poor lad, orphaned, or worse than orphaned, might be saved by the timely intervention of an elder man who per-

haps has passed through danger himself, or, at least, has known by observation the dangers that await some men! But the intervention is wanting and the lad goes to ruin. Or again, the man of weak character, easily led by his companions, might be saved from himself were he taken in hand by one stronger than he, and by sheer force of companionship kept in the right way; but he is allowed to drift away amongst companions who will do him no good. Men look on and call him a weak fool perhaps; but none think to make a companion of him and so rescue him from his foolishness. Yet another drifts away from religion, not from any positive disbelief but from sheer indifference. He is one of those who need from time to time a friendly word of counsel, but he does not get it. In unostentatious ways such as these the working-man's apostolate must work, doing constant work of which the world will seldom hear and for which no credit is given on this side of the grave, but which will surely be recorded in eternity. Of the possibilities in the way of the corporal works of mercy there is no need to write. None help the poor so well in their corporal wants as the poor themselves. It is in the exercise of spiritual mercy—in the saving of their fellow-men

from moral and spiritual disaster—that the Christian working-man often fails. He does not do what in him lies to save the drifting souls whom he might save. He has a notion that it is the priest's duty to look after the souls of men, forgetting, or perhaps never having realized, that in their constant influence upon each other one man inevitably helps to save or damn the souls of other men, and that it is the part of an honest man to strive to save whenever he can.

Undoubtedly one of the most pressing needs of the hour is to educate our Catholic working-class to their responsibility as exponents of Catholic social teaching. In the time of need when the Church is face to face with the forces of secularism—and the time is not far ahead—the strength of the Church will largely depend upon an army of Catholic working-men and women such as I have described. It is they, more than others, who will save the toiling multitude to Christianity and the Church.

St Francis and You:

AN APPEAL TO FRANCISCAN TERTIARIES

I. THE FRANCISCAN VOCATION

THE Franciscan Order has, from its infancy, considered itself especially commissioned by God to oppose the selfishness and luxury of the world. To every religious Order is given some special mission, which justifies its existence as a society within the larger society of the Church. To some Orders is given one sort of ministry, to others another. Each Order has its particular character and ministry, though all are inspired by the same divine Spirit; and it is by the energy and zeal with which the Order discharges its own special ministry that it is to be judged worthy or unworthy, healthy or diseased. As soon as it ceases to do the work for which it is founded, an Order has no longer any proper claim to exist. Its members may appeal to the glories of the past; they may recite the wonderful deeds of their fathers in days gone by. But the only honest answer to such glorying in the past is the admonition, "Go and do likewise!" The past has its reward;

the present must be judged by the present.

But there are times and moments in history when life becomes more intense, when men's souls are awake with expectation or oppressed with a sense of mystery. Such moments are the beginning of new epochs in the world's history; moments which search men's lives, individually and corporately, as in a crucible, and prove their real value. To-day, undoubtedly, we witness one of these supreme moments in history. A new age is before us, with ideals and purposes quite different from those which have governed the world hitherto. A new spirit has entered into the world and gained dominance, and is transforming nations and governments and men's private lives. World-facts cannot be ignored without virtually blaspheming the Providence which rules the world; and the entrance of the new spirit into man's life is a veritable world-fact.

Now, whatever affects the world affects the Church. Every new development in secular history means a new phase of life to be won by the Church. The Church cannot ignore the world; she has to gain it for Christ, and to consecrate it to God's service in all its developments and evolutions. To cut herself off from the world's life as it rolls ever onward, and rest con-

tent with the past, is impossible to the Church if she is to fulfil her mission. No; she can never rest whilst the world goes forward without betraying her trust. Every new phase of the world's life must be incorporated in the historic growth of the Church Catholic. To-day, then, Catholics have need to be "strong and perfect Christians," willing to sacrifice themselves—their ease and their personal interests, their prejudices and smaller ideals —to the larger interest of winning the modern world to Christ and His Church; men who will not shrink from battle, nor fear hardship and toil. This is a time when the Church needs apostles to convert the new world of thought and action that has sprung up in these days; and she calls upon her children to do their part, each according to his ability and opportunity, in the work that lies before her.

Now, a special obligation rests upon Franciscans to prove themselves at this moment soldiers of Christ in very deed; and to emulate the example of their first brethren, who, in a crisis of the world's history in many ways similar to that of to-day, effected so wonderful a transformation in the life of the people.

St Francis was raised up by God "to support the tottering fabric of His Church." Mediæval society had become degenerate,

and in the break-up of the social system it seemed as though the Church had lost her power over her people. Heresy was fast sapping the foundations of faith, and the Church was unable to resist because her strength was already sapped by luxury and worldliness. The religious disruption which took place three centuries later might have taken place then but for St Francis and St Dominic: the one sent for the defence of the Faith against heresy, the other for the reform of Christian society itself. Whilst St Dominic set himself to root out heresy, St Francis laid the foundation of a new social order of things within the Church itself. This was his special work, and the work of his Order —to induce Christian society to live by Christian principles; to be Christians in very deed as well as by profession. And how did he set about this heroic work? By launching forth against the degenerate feudal society of his time his Tertiary army, each man and woman of which was pledged to do justice, avoid civic feuds, renounce inordinate luxury, and promote universal charity and peace. It was a veritable crusade, in which St Francis accomplished that dream of his youth when he aspired to don the Cross and go forth to the holy war. But now his war was not against Saracens and infidels, nor with

sword and lance. He was to fight against the evils of Christian society, and deliver Christendom from the dangers that lurked within its own walls. Such was the warfare in which he was to become a great captain and leader of men.

The Franciscan movement was a great social reformation: it led men forward to heaven by making the way on earth straighter and more like unto heaven. It dealt not with general abstract principles, but with the actual facts of the world. It did not preach the Gospel from monastic stalls nor with the aloofness of one looking on from afar off; but it dwelt amongst the people and grappled with the evils of the system under which the people lived; the civic feuds, the intense selfishness, the luxuriousness and effeminacy of the thirteenth century. These were the evils which were de-christianizing mediæval society and making religion itself a mere ceremonial. In the cathedrals and minsters the choristers sang their daily psalm: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and all they that dwell therein. . . . Who shall ascend unto the mountain of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? The innocent in hands and the clean of heart, who hath not taken his soul in vain, nor sworn deceitfully to his neighbour." So sang

the choristers: but judged by that standard the world of the thirteenth century had little chance of standing in the holy place. Then St Francis founded his Order to be a refuge for all whose souls revolted against the corruption and sin of the time; and when he extended his Order so as to embrace men and women living in the world, he created a hostile camp in the midst of the world, itself to do battle with the social immorality of a degenerate age. To the hatreds, injustices and luxury of the time he opposed a body of men and women animated by the spirit of Christian brotherhood and of Christian simplicity. This was the real significance of the Third Order; it was a great social reform founded upon an awakening of the people's conscience to the evils of the age in which they lived. As the Abbé le Monnier has well remarked in his "History of St Francis": "The Third Order may be said to be one of the greatest efforts ever attempted for introducing more justice among men. . . . They (the Tertiaries) changed the then existing social order in favour of the weak and humble." Le Monnier goes on to show how this came about. The chief means in the hands of the feudal nobles was the exaction of the oath of fealty and military service from those who sought their protection or be-

came in any way their clients. In this manner the greater part of the people became the mere tools of the nobles, and it is easily understood how such a system could lend itself to the most crying tyranny and injustice. The noble could demand the service of his vassal in pursuit of some feud, however unjust; and, according to the recognized system, the vassal had no right to refuse. St Francis, by laying upon his Tertiaries the precept never to take an oath except in certain specified cases, and never to bear arms except in defence of the Church, struck a fatal blow at the entire system. How the petty tyrants of Italy, where the Order originated, strove at first to prevent the spreading of the Order, and how, when they could not succeed in this, they tried to neutralize its effects, is well told by Le Monnier. They failed, because the conscience of the people was now against them. The question was not now one of politics, but of religion.

The Rule of the Order, however, was framed, not merely against the feuds and civic rivalries of the time, but also against the excessive luxury which characterized the rise of the merchant class, the progenitor of modern industrialism. The Tertiaries lived frugally, and were forbidden to dress beyond what was becoming to

their station in society; and the money thus saved from luxury was given to the poor. One can but faintly imagine the difference wrought in society by the wide-spreading of an Order founded upon such principles; and we listen without surprise to the remark of a contemporary writer, that it seemed in many places as though the days of primitive Christianity had returned.

The Rule of the Third Order, especially in the form sanctioned by Nicholas IV, referred directly to the actual evils of later mediæval society, and in many instances has no direct bearing upon the peculiar evils of modern days. Thus, the precept against bearing arms has little actual significance now, when men are not accustomed to carry weapons in ordinary life either for aggression or defence. And the particular rules about dress are of no meaning to-day. The world has changed in these respects; and were the Third Order instituted merely to do away with these specific evils, it would no longer be of any value in the Church. But these specific rules were merely an adaptation of the essential motive of the Franciscan Order to the particular needs of those days. The value of these specific rules has passed away; but the essential motive remains, and is as actual to-day as

ever in the past. That motive is to bring about a realization of the spirit of Christian brotherhood among men, and to oppose the luxury and selfishness which destroys Christian life both in the individual and in society. For this purpose did St Francis institute his Order; and who shall say that purpose is not of actual value to-day? It only requires to be applied to the actual necessities of the age to make it as real in these days as it was in his own. The language in which he gave his message of peace and good-will to men in the thirteenth century is not our language; but we know what his message is, and it is for us to put it into language understood by the people of to-day.

Do Franciscans always realize this truth as they should? Must we not acknowledge in sheer honesty that there is some truth in the taunt implied in the question, "Where are the Tertiaries?" "We have heard," people sometimes say, "of what Franciscans did in the past, but where are they to-day, and what are they doing?"

The tertiary may justly reply that, like the Church in general, the Franciscan Order has had no fair chance as yet to prove itself a social force in the modern industrial nations; and that we

cannot be fairly blamed for not putting forth flowers when we had hardly been well planted in the soil. For the immediate past, then, we need make no excuse. But the future is before us great with historic issues; and for that we must needs be much concerned. When the faith has once more triumphed, and the modern world is brought to the feet of Christ, what will be the judgement of posterity on the part taken by us Franciscans? Will it be said that we did our part worthily, as became disciples of the great Francis? For ourselves, it might matter little what judgement posterity will pass on us, were it not that we hope to meet St Francis, when this life is past, and that we shall have to face his judgement too. It cannot be said that signs are wanting to us, giving us warning of our duty. The voice of the supreme Pontiff has been heard appealing to Tertiaries "to save society." Even outside the Church voices have been heard invoking the name of Francis, as though it still had a magic power over men's minds. "I wish God would let St Francis come back to us. He is badly wanted. What a difference one good man makes in a naughty world! What a lot of us poor wandering, pleasure-loving, paltry-proud sinners he is worth! What a 'leader'

he would make! And wouldn't I like to be the lowest private in *his* Salvation Army?" He who wrote these words echoed the thought of many a soul that has asked, like himself, "*Is* Christianity true?" And when even they who know not Christianity to be divine look to St Francis for guidance, is it not a sign that we Franciscans have a work to do in this present world of ours?

In fact, Franciscanism has already begun to stir itself in response to the call. For several years past, each year has witnessed some evidence that it is awakening out of the torpor into which it has seemed to have fallen, owing, in part at least, to causes beyond its control. Congresses and re-unions have been held in various countries, showing an evident endeavour has been made to restore the Third Order to its original purpose as a great social influence. At the Limoges congress in 1894—the first of the national congresses—the Tertiaries present pledged themselves "to work for the reign of social justice." Many resolutions were passed having for their object to bring the Third Order into touch with the actual needs of the day. It was recognized that Tertiaries are no longer wanted to fight against feudal wrongs and injustices. But our own industrial system has its

own wrongs and injustices, and against these the Tertiaries of these days must do battle if they are to be of any value in the Church to-day. They must put on the mantle of the blessed Luchesio, the first Tertiary, and like him preach by example the gospel of Christian brotherhood and unworldliness. Such was the idea of a Tertiary expounded at the Limoges congress, and by none more convincingly than the well-known Tertiary layman, M. Léon Harmel, who for years had already set an example to French manufacturers of the relations which should exist between employer and employed. The specific resolutions passed at the congress of Limoges were, as they should be, especially framed to meet the social needs in France; but the value of the congress to the entire Third Order was that it pointed out the way to make Franciscan influence once more an actual factor in the world's life; it reverted to the original purpose of the Third Order, but brought the Order into line with existing circumstances.

At other conferences much the same note of actuality has been sounded, and the same desire to arrive at some practical purpose equal to the original design of the Order. Tertiaries were repeatedly reminded that theirs is an active aposto-

late to bring home to the social life of the people the teaching of Jesus Christ. Shall it be, then, that with these warning voices calling to us, we shall fail to give a fitting response? That depends in great measure upon the individual response of all who call themselves Franciscans.

Our duty, then, is to bring home the message of St Francis to the modern world, the message of brotherhood and unworldliness, of charity and self-restraint.

Not for a moment, however, must it be thought that the Franciscan should approach the world in the mood of a pessimist. The world is never wholly bad; it is always an admixture of good and evil. In so far as it is good it is a revelation of the life of God who created it, and in its constant progression from one phase to another it unfolds continually some new knowledge of its divine Prototype. We can have no part, then, in the heresy which beholds in the evolutions of the world's life only the work of the Evil One. Franciscans indeed inherit from St Francis a true delight in the constant stream of life ever rushing forward to its final perfection.* They cannot for-

* "It is rare," says the Abbé le Monnier, "that a saint has lived so thoroughly in the spirit of his age. He (St Francis) began by being an accomplished representative of it."—*Introduction to "History of St Francis."*

get that the Francis who received the stigmata was the same Francis who loved the songs of Provence, who loved the new-born freedom of his native city, who delighted in the refinements of chivalry peculiar to his own age. There have been saints who seemed entirely dead to the life of the world around them. To different apostles, different spirits; but ours is the spirit of St Francis: and in his spirit it is for us to love and prize whatever is good and beautiful in the age in which we live.

We rejoice in the spirit of liberty which pervades our civil and political institutions; we are proud of the manly self-reliance and princely initiative so generally found amongst our people. But because we love our own people and our own time, we are the more keenly alive to the dangers that threaten us, and to the responsibilities these dangers impose upon us.

At a time like the present, when the Church is setting herself to regain the Northern nations, it is especially incumbent upon all Catholics to set the example of a high standard of social duty; and in this matter the duty of Catholics in general is, by reason of their special profession, more particularly the duty of the Franciscan Tertiary.

II. THE THREE RADICAL EVILS OF OUR DAY

THERE are three radical evils in our present social system against which the Church will have to oppose all the weight of her influence if society is to be saved from itself.

In the first place there is the intense selfishness of modern industry. Based essentially upon free and open competition, it has tended to develop in the nation that spirit of self-reliance and personal initiative of which we may well be proud; but it has also degenerated too frequently into a means of oppressing the weak and ignorant. By it the nation has become rich and powerful; it has created fabulous wealth, and for great numbers of the people has raised the standard of comfort higher than ever before in the nation's history. At the same time, it has created wealth and comfort at a bitter cost: the cost of comfortless lives, incessant labour, and the estrangement of class from class. It has developed the sweating system, bloated monopolies and trusts, whereby the lives of the poor are made a constant misery and anxiety, through uncertain labour and starvation wages. The tradesman of small capital is at the mercy of

the large capitalist, and little mercy he experiences at times. When the market is overstocked with workers, the opportunity is taken to lessen a wage oftentimes already hardly just. In the competition between rival companies the worker is made to suffer, in order that the employer may compete successfully and yet not lose his own profits. The owner of house property in a crowded city seizes his chance of exacting higher rents as the city becomes more crowded. Men must have some sort of shelter; their need becomes the selfish owner's cruellest ally in exacting a rent out of all proportion to the wretched tenement rented. Gambling and speculation, in one form or another, has become an ordinary source of income. To be able to outwit one's neighbour is considered almost a virtue.

In such a condition of society the weak, the ignorant, the unintelligent and the poor have no chance of escaping social degradation and constant suffering. True, the balance is slightly righted by the doles of charity now and again thrown out by some successful speculator; but such doles can never repay the poor for the injustice and misery inflicted by the grasping competitor or clever gambler.

Yet it is not fair to blame those only who succeed and rise upon the wave of

commercial prosperity. If men and women are sweated to death for a miserable pittance, who are to blame? Not the employers only, though their sin is great; but all who patronize such labour contribute to the sin. The insatiable yearning to buy cheaply, without any thought as to whether cheapness is consistent with fair wages: this is the incentive which tempts men to buy cheap labour and underpay the workman. Were people in general not willing accomplices, there would be no sweating system, no unfair competition. The sin falls not on the few, but on the many, who too readily condone the sin of the few for the sake of the resultant advantage to themselves. They pay a halfpenny less for a pound of sugar, or a shilling or two less on a ton of coal: what does the public care that the shop assistant or the miner is unable to get a human wage? Wherefore this craze for cheapness, but that most often there may be more money to spend in unnecessary luxuries, in fine ribbons or a better brand of tobacco and such like. It is the increasing luxury of the period which gives the public its thirst for cheapness and condones the injustice of the sweater and smiles on the successful gambler.

The appalling fact, however, is that the majority of people are blind to the

injustice of it all. They take for granted the morality of the principle: "Each man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." It never occurs to them to question the Christianity of the principle upon which the whole system of injustice is founded. They would consider it a crime to pilfer their neighbour's pocket; they don't think twice about underselling him in order to make him a bankrupt, and so clear the way for their own monopoly. They demand judgement upon a man who failed to remove poison out of the reach of a child or lunatic, whilst they themselves are hoodwinking their neighbour into a bad bargain. Commercial speculation and intercourse are, in fact, placed outside the ordinary Christian law. When it comes to buying and selling, hiring and being hired, all idea of inherent justice and Christian charity is put aside. "We cannot conduct business on the principles of the eight beatitudes" is their variation of the famous dictum of the Anglican bishop.

Now this is just one of the points where society to-day needs Christianity most urgently. Christian principles must enter into business transactions equally as into any other act of life. A healthy rivalry in trade, based upon ability and energy, is quite consistent with justice and charity, and with that regard one for

another which the Gospel commands. It is the grasping, selfish abuse of ability and strength which is incompatible with the Gospel. Under an evangelic condition of commercial dealings, there would doubtless be fewer mighty fortunes; but there would probably be more general comfort, and a greater proportion between the conditions of rich and poor; there would be less luxury, but also less misery. The idler would be banned from society; but the helpless and the luckless would not be left to starve in a garret.

Is it impossible, we ask, to get men in these days to base their commercial transactions—their buying and selling—upon that justice and charity which is the groundwork of truly Christian society? St Francis, in his day, did not find it impossible to supplant the civic feud by Christian fellowship: why should it be impossible in these days to supplant commercial selfishness by the self-same spirit of Christian fellowship? Is it too much to ask Franciscan Tertiaries to pledge themselves to strive after justice in dealing with their neighbours; not to take an unfair advantage of their neighbour's weakness or necessity; to consider, before they demand cheap goods, whether such goods can be sold cheaply without decreasing the fair wage of the labourer; to pay a

"human wage" when they hire labour;* and to give a just return in labour for wages received? Such a pledge to-day would correspond with the civic pledge demanded of the first Tertiaries by St Francis. Then it was the free use of arms which caused the misery; now it is the selfish use of open competition.

If Franciscan Tertiaries would set themselves to oppose by their example the commercial sin of this age, truly they would show themselves the standard-bearers of that Christian Brotherhood of which St Francis dreamed, and for which he prayed with constant prayer.

But it may be objected that whoever would set himself to act in his commercial dealings differently from the community at large will suffer much loss and hardly succeed in whatever business he may undertake; that nothing can be done until all men agree to be Christians in business. The answer to such objection is given by the early disciples of our Lord. Had they waited for the whole world to become Christian before themselves professing their faith, there would have been no Christian Church. Had the first Tertiaries held back until the whole of mediæval

* Pope Leo XIII describes a "human wage" as that which allows a man and his family to live in reasonable comfort.

society responded to St Francis' Rule, the Third Order would not have existed, nor would the Tertiaries have effected the great revolution which they did effect. Some personal loss or suffering accompanies every good work: the world was redeemed on Calvary. And is not the device of the Order, the stigmata of Christ and St Francis, commemorative of our holy founder's precept that we "follow Christ and Him crucified"? Whoever is unwilling to suffer some loss or some pain in the cause of the Gospel has assuredly no right to the Christian name.

Commercial selfishness, however, is but the primary sin of the age. In its wake have followed two other urgent evils, against which it becomes the duty of Franciscans to bear witness. One of these evils is intemperance in drink; the other, the growing disregard for the sanctity of domestic life.

Intemperance in drink is an evil manifest to all. It has rightly been called the most glaring evil of the day. The demoralization of so large a part of the country, begun by greed of money, bids fair to be completed by intemperance. Men's lives are constantly wrecked; homes are broken up; and, worst of all, the craving for drink is transmitted from parent to child, making the child's life a perpetual

misery from the almost irresistible temptation to which the child is exposed. Can we wonder if so many men in early youth give up the struggle and succumb to their parents' sin? Amongst the poor intemperance shows its worst effects. Badly fed, they more easily collapse before the temptation; and wherever they go they are beckoned onward and allured to their fate by the numberless public-houses that infest our cities and towns and villages. As Cardinal Vaughan well said at the Stockport Catholic Conference of 1899: "The houses of the trade are studded over the most squalid and poorest districts, and as so many vampires suck the life-blood out of the bodies of the poor. . . . They are traps baited to catch the poor man. They care not who comes in—a labourer with his wages, a wife or mother in anguish and distress, a bright boy, a sickly girl, a little child—all are welcome, have they only a copper. The coppers roll up into silver, the silver into gold, and gigantic fortunes are rapidly made. The rich become richer and richer as they eat the flesh of the poor man and drink his blood, without even a thought to the ruin of his soul. Disease, crime, pauperism are perpetuated; sixty thousand persons a year perish through drink." And another speaker at the same Conference said: "In

our modern English world the practical Christianity of our people depends on this, whether they let themselves down to be serfs and slaves of the public-house, or whether they keep away from it."

It is much that public opinion in England has at last induced the Government to enact far-reaching reforms in regard to licensed houses, reforms which will undoubtedly do much to lessen the evil. Fewer licensed houses and more stringent regulations as to serving the young and the habitual drunkard with drink should go far to remedy the mischief done by the almost unrestrained liberty of the drink-traffic.

At the same time, whilst the law can remove temptation in some measure from the path of the weak, we must never forget that the only effective remedy is personal self-restraint and self-imposed moderation. And in bringing this about we owe much to those temperance societies which, since the days of the Franciscan friar, Father Mathew, have worked so valiantly to stem the tide of the evil. To those who, under Father Mathew's leadership, took the heroic measure of total abstinence as the surest way to do successful combat with a vice that seemed almost insuperable, too much praise cannot be given. To their self-sacrifice is owing

principally the awakening of the popular conscience to the gravity of the evil. Total abstinence, however, is an heroic remedy, not to be imposed on every man.

All, indeed, are not able to keep to total abstinence; but these can at least avoid taking alcoholic drink for the mere pleasure of taking it. The same rule should be applied to drink as is applied by all self-respecting men to food generally: not to eat outside of one's meals except in case of necessity; and even at one's meals to eat in moderation. A similar law should be imposed upon oneself in regard to alcoholic drink. The fatal habit of intemperance is more often than not acquired through the habit of drinking for pleasure when one meets an acquaintance or joins a party. If the nation could be induced to give up this custom, a long stride would have been taken towards making our people sober.*

The English bishops some years ago endeavoured to institute the temperance movement upon this wider basis. They asked those who could to pledge themselves to abstain from alcoholic drink altogether; those who did not feel them-

* Since these words were first written the Anti-Treating League has taken a secure footing in Ireland and is spreading elsewhere, much to the advantage of the temperance cause.

selves able to do this, they asked to abstain in certain circumstances: as, for example, to avoid taking drink outside meals or in public-houses.

To Franciscan Tertiaries the temperance question is indeed one of deep concern. A great number of the Tertiaries belong to the working class. They, like other working-men and women, are exposed to the awful temptation of the public-house. Is it asking too much of them if we appeal to them to set their neighbours good example by avoiding the public-house as the working-man's direst enemy? If they need their glass of beer let them take it in their own homes in strict moderation; but let them, even at the cost of some personal inconvenience, avoid drinking in the public-house, and let them induce others to avoid the public-house likewise. In the avoidance of the drinking-bar lies the salvation of the majority of the working-class. It is difficult for many to refuse the friendly invitation to enter the public-house and have a glass of beer; and to many the difficulty arises from the seeming churlishness or want of geniality of the refusal. But, as has been said before, all good works present some difficulty; in this case, however, the chief difficulty will vanish when men recognize that the refusal comes from honest con-

viction and is accompanied by no boastful self-conceit.

It would be wrong, however, to think that the poor only are subjects of intemperance. The vice permeates all grades of society; and there is need for the apostle of temperance everywhere. The Rule of the Third Order lays it upon Tertiaries to be frugal in meat and drink. At the present day there is especially need of "frugality" in drink; and not merely of ordinary frugality, but of some sacrifice in the cause of helping our weaker fellowmen in a battle against one of the most fatal vices of the day. "Bear ye one another's burdens," is the divine precept: unless we bear something of the burden of the intemperate, how shall they be saved?

We come now to that other great danger which threatens society: the dishonouring of domestic life. The domestic circle is the cradle of the nation; if that be degenerate, this must shortly totter to its ruin. Around the hearth the child's life is formed; there, too, the most intimate and sacred qualities of a man's character are developed. Destroy the home, and you take away from the ordinary man the strongest inducement to self-sacrifice and to persistent energy: for in the home a man learns to forget

himself in those he loves; in their presence he unfolds his simpler and nobler self. To most men a pure and happy home is the very gate of heaven, saving them from the baser part of themselves. But it must be a pure and happy home; otherwise it becomes a veritable hell upon earth. *Corruptio optimi pessima est.*

Now the secret of home life depends in the first place on conjugal fidelity, and secondly on filial devotion. In both these respects we cannot contemplate our present world without grave misgiving. The marriage bond is becoming looser; the moral tie between children and parents is getting thin. Filial reverence is no longer the power is was; but, then, neither is the marriage bond. With the desecration of marriage home life is impossible. Every year, unfortunately, divorces and judicial separations increase; and separations of husband and wife by mutual consent are perhaps even more frequent. Marriage is becoming among many a mere by-word; and thus the very foundation of Christian society is threatened.

The causes of this state of things are not far to seek. There is the self-indulgence and impatience of restraint coincident with an age of luxury, both material and intellectual. Individualism, unchecked by the Gospel, will naturally throw off all

bonds; and liberty degenerates into licentiousness. Marriage, according to the Gospel, is not an indulgence, but a responsibility. It imposes a restraint; it signifies a duty. It neither legalizes vice nor puts aside the virtue of chastity. It is a sacrament, symbolical of the union of God and the soul, of Christ and the world; a religious bond, therefore, demanding the utmost reverence and a stern purity. But this is not how marriage is regarded by many in society to-day. People rush into marriage heedless of its sanctity and responsibility; they are constrained by the impulse of the moment, or they buy and are bought, or they thirst for the excitement of a new venture, or they are impatient "to be settled in life," without serious thought as to whether they can together fulfil the life-long responsibility of the marriage state. When will people learn to prepare for marriage as for a great religious act—an act which, for its highest fulfilment, requires a clean life in the past as well as an honest purpose for the future? When will they learn that in getting married they take upon themselves one of the most solemn duties possible to man? Whilst men and women enter recklessly into the marriage state there will always be homes that are dens of misery and vice.

Even when marriage is entered into, as it should be, with a sense of its sanctity and responsibility, there will always be required that unceasing moral vigilance and self-restraint, and that single-eyed adherence to duty, which alone guarantees the faithful discharge of a difficult vocation. Self-denial is of the very essence of conjugal devotion. Husband and wife, from the moment that they pronounce their vows, owe to each other a supreme devotion and affection, such as they can give to no other creature. To deprive each other, in any way, of that supreme devotion is to derogate from their vow. They may have friendships and gather each around them a circle of acquaintances: but such friendships have not the sacramental character of the supreme devotion they owe each other, and, if need be, must be sacrificed to that supreme devotion.

Moreover, they owe to each other a high reverence as partners in a great religious act and duty. This reverence implies a constant respect for the individual character of each other. As the Sarum Missal has it, husband and wife are "two souls in one body." Each must respect in the other their spiritual individuality, which can be subject to God alone. The wife's conscience is not under the control of the

husband, nor the husband's under the control of the wife; neither is it to be supposed that the ideal husband and wife will have just the same intellectual tastes or qualities of character. Indeed, the true beauty of married life is in the harmony of two different characters conjoined in seeking one and the same high purpose in life. But such a harmony can exist only where there is unselfishness and self-denial. Marriage, like every other state in life, is glorified only by the cross.

To convince the modern world of the sanctity of marriage is, in truth, one of the most urgent tasks before the Church in this country. Young men and young women must be taught that marriage is a solemn duty and a religious act. They must be told that to prepare themselves to enter into this sacramental state they must endeavour to keep themselves pure from their youth; not rush recklessly into marriage before they are satisfied that they are fitted for its responsibilities. And parents, too, must be brought to think well of the responsibility they incur when endeavouring to arrange marriages for their children. How many a mother has sold her daughter into perpetual misery for the sake of social influence! And are we to wonder if the daughter after awhile finds the bond un-

bearable and severs it? In such a case the mother has sinned rather than the daughter; and she has sinned doubly: against the desecrated sacrament and against the daughter whom she condemned to misery.

Amongst the poor such cases as these are but seldom found. The poor are not sold for social influence; but they sometimes do bargain themselves away for food and shelter: a more excusable fault, but one to be deplored. In other ways, however, the poor learn but too easily from the laxity of the rich and educated: as someone has remarked, the vices of the rich filter through to the poor. To save both rich and poor, then, the Church has in these days need to assert vehemently the sacramental character of marriage, as she has ever done. This, indeed, has ever been one of her brightest glories, that she has unceasingly upheld the sanctity of marriage. But do Catholics themselves always enter into the married state with that sense of responsibility which should be expected from them? Are our Catholic young men and maidens taught to regard marriage as the fitting crown of a pure life? This is the only way to safeguard the sacrament against desecration, and to invest it with the proper dignity of a sacramental state. Are our Catholic

youths, again, made to realize that the duties of husband and wife go beyond the avoidance of legal infidelity, and imply a constant reverence and devotion towards each other higher than they may show towards any other man or woman? It is for Catholics to set the example: and an example so manifest and far beyond reproach that none may cavil at them. Then, and then only, will they be able to induce their non-Catholic fellow-citizens to recognize the sanctity of the marriage vow and the indissolubility of the marriage tie. Marriage is indissoluble because it is a sacrament: and a sacrament is a holy thing, to be approached with holy thoughts and reverenced with holy deeds.

In the crusade against the desecration of sacramental marriage, who should be first if not Franciscan Tertiaries? Husbands and wives who are Tertiaries should indeed set before themselves the highest ideal of their state with its responsibilities. Tertiary husbands should remember that it was St Louis of France, the patron saint of the brethren of the Third Order, who described the triple devotion of his own life as "God, France and Margaret!" Next to God and the country of which he was the ruler, came his wife; and, besides her, no other in the same high

category of personal devotion. And who has not read of the beautiful, and almost romantic, affection which existed between St Elizabeth of Hungary and her husband? And St Elizabeth is patroness of the Sisters of the Third Order. In truth, both St Louis and St Elizabeth seem to have realized in their own conjugal relationships the ideal marriage described by one of our greatest moralists, when he insisted that the same true and courteous love which marks the period of courtship should continue throughout married life, growing not less intense but more.* With the examples of their patron saints before them, our Tertiaries who are married may fairly be expected to endeavour to realize in themselves the proper dignity of their state, giving the world of to-day a much-needed lesson in conjugal fidelity and devotion, and so educating

* "We think that a reverent and tender duty is due to one whose affection we still doubt, and whose character we as yet do but partially and distantly discern; and that this reverence and duty are to be withdrawn when the affection has become wholly and limitlessly our own, and the character has been so sifted and tried that we fear not to entrust it with the happiness of our lives. Do you not see how ignoble this is as well as how unreasonable? Do you not feel that marriage—when it is marriage at all—is only the seal which marks the vowed transition of temporary into untiring service, and of fitful into eternal love?"—"*Sesame and Lilies*," II, 66.

their children that they, too, unless called by another vocation, may become worthy husbands or wives. The children of to-day are the parents of to-morrow, and with them lies the hope or despair of the future. Children must be *prepared* for marriage. Yet how many parents realize their duty towards their children in this respect? But where parents themselves have but a shallow conception of the sanctity and responsibility of their state, how can they teach their children the higher ideal?

One fact there is in the present social system which renders it still more imperative that both our young men and young women be convinced of the high responsibilities of marriage; that fact is the increasing social independence of women. The woman who has some definite occupation in life, and who is able to earn her own livelihood, will less readily accept the man who seeks her hand unless he be worthy of her, and shows her that respect and reverence which Christian man should give to Christian woman. True, this very independence, unless met on the part of men with a virtue that commands respect, is not without its dangers. But her new-born independence makes woman in greater measure the arbiter of her own destiny, and that, in the long run, must conduce to a higher ideal of mar-

riage. The fact of this independence, however, imposes upon parents a still more onerous duty of educating their children to take none but the noblest view of that state to which the vast majority of them are called. From their childhood they need, now more than ever heretofore, to be taught to restrain their natural selfishness, to act with forethought, to assume responsibility when they claim a right or privilege. They must be trained to use their independence with discretion and honesty. They must be deeply convinced that there is a God to whom they owe allegiance in every step they take along the path of life. Thus educated, our young women will make the better wives, because they are able to accept more freely their husbands; and our young men will be better husbands in the presence of a free and noble womanhood.

The future lies with the children of to-day; but the children's fate is in great measure in the hands of the parents. If the marriage of the future is to be of a Christian and sacramental character, the parents of to-day, by word and example, must help their children to realize fully what Christian and sacramental marriage is.

Here, then, we have the three evils

which to-day shake the foundation of society—commercial selfishness, intemperance in drink and the desecration of the marriage vow. Against these evils we call upon Franciscan Tertiaries, and all who love St Francis, to raise the Christian standard of "Brotherhood, Temperance and Purity"; to oppose to the vices of the world the principles of the Gospel as they are especially needed at this time.

Those who call themselves by the name of the seraphic saint—Franciscans—have the most urgent duty to set before their fellow-men examples of high Christian virtue. St Francis ever identified the glory of Jesus Christ with the moral welfare of the human race. He who had Christ in his heart, as he bore Christ's stigmata in his body, bore also in his mind and heart the great human world, with its joys and sorrows, its sunshine and storms. He loved the world as Christ loved the world. To St Francis the Incarnation was the central fact of human history; and the soft light of the Incarnation lay over all the earth. Only when the world's life was perfected would Christ's glory be complete; only when He had gained His kingdom would the joy of Christ be fulfilled. Thus to our holy founder the cause of humanity was

the cause of Christ, as the cause of Christ was the cause of humanity. To complete the work of the Incarnation, by bringing the world's life into harmony with the teaching of the Gospel, was the saint's most fervent wish. Hence he would spend days and nights in tearful prayer, begging for mercy on a sinful world. And when his prayer was said, he would arise and go forth to preach from town to town the doctrine of the love of Christ and the Christian brotherhood, hoping to draw men away from their selfishness and greed and utter worldliness. And the result of his preaching was that thousands were drawn to the love of Christ and the love of their fellow-men, and that wonderful reformation was worked in mediæval society which brought back to men's minds the scriptural record of the primitive Church. Thus to us Franciscans he left an example; and if we would be reckoned his true disciples we must do as he did, as far as our weaker power will permit us: we must bring home to the world the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and show the world of to-day wherein it fails to live according to the Gospel.

The present age, with its stirring life and restless energy, calls for an active apostolate as stirring and restless as itself. No Catholic, and still less a Fran-

ciscan, can sleep out his vocation to-day. We must all be up and doing, each according to his ability and opportunity. That which all can do, and are bound to do, is to model their own lives upon the principles of the Gospel, and to resist the world when it preaches another Gospel differing from that of Jesus Christ. Against the world's selfishness we must oppose justice and that spirit of human brotherhood which Christ so constantly preached; against the drink evil we must oppose temperance; against the growing desecration of marriage it is needful to oppose the indissolubility and sanctity of the marriage tie. In our own measure we can do much by earnest conviction and faithful endeavour. Persistent endeavour it is which arouses the world's conscience, and wins it finally to the right. Personal example—that is ever, in the moral order, the lever which works either the world's ruin or its salvation.

"Brotherhood, Temperance, Purity!" these should be the watchwords of the Franciscan in these days; the keynotes of his own life: the text of his preaching to others.

III. THE NEED OF PERSONAL SERVICE

We have spoken of the sins of our present social life; we must now turn our thoughts to what undoubtedly is the dread legacy of long centuries of social injustice and commercial greed. The problem of "Darkest England" will never be solved simply by preaching a higher morality to the world at large. The degradation—material and spiritual—of the poor in the modern industrial nations is of too vast a nature for any but heroic measures. Never, perhaps, except in pagan Rome, has Christianity witnessed so sorry a spectacle as the slum-lands of these days. "Without comfort in this world or hope of the next," such is the life of thousands of our poor; and the worst of it is, as some one has already pointed out, they don't know, many of them, their own need; they have lost even the idea of a happier, healthier life. Cut off from all that is refined, continually harassed by the uncertainty of being able to earn enough to satisfy their hunger, herded together in unsanitary and overcrowded dwellings, is it a wonder that after a few years the slum youth gives up all idea of bettering himself, if that idea ever enters his brain? And so every year denizens of

the slum are recruited from its own children that might do better if they had the opportunity, and from the numbers who begin life on a higher plane but sink down to the lower, either through their own fault or, more frequently, because no hand is put forth to strengthen their helplessness. And it is very easy for the better class of the poor to slip down among the lowest. Inability to get regular work (and it is often difficult for the willing man to get employment even in this busy commercial age, as they know who have lived among the poor); sickness or domestic trouble—these are some of the causes which bring even the honest workman to the door of starvation. And if it is retorted that drink, too, is often the cause of their fall, let us not judge too harshly, but remember the temptation. As Cardinal Vaughan said at the Catholic Conference already referred to, the sin is as much and even more theirs who tempt the workingman to drink by placing a public-house in his path wherever he turns. "Darkest England" is, in fact, the creation of that selfish individualism which has ruled society in England these last four centuries; which has, indeed, created wealth and material prosperity for the nation at large, but has also driven the poor and the helpless into moral slavery.

I do not think I can do better than summarize here the words of Cardinal Vaughan on this very question. Speaking of "the lamentable state of the masses of our poor," he pointed out that "it is a natural result of utilitarian philosophy, of the inordinate growth of selfish individualism, which was substituted in the sixteenth century for the old Catholic polity. . . . . The suppression of the monasteries and the guilds, the transference of their lands and of the great commons of England to the rich, created a lackland and beggared poor. . . . Without ties to bind the people to the land, they have been driven, especially of late years, in ever-increasing multitudes to the towns. Here they have herded apart from the better classes, forming an atmosphere and a society marked, on the one hand by an absence of all elevating influences of wealth, education and refinement, and on the other by the depressing presence of almost a dead level of poverty, ignorance and squalor. They are not owners either of the scraps of land on which they live or of the tenements that cover them; but are rack-rented by the agents of absentee landlords, who know less of them than Dives knew of Lazarus." In this passage the Cardinal has put his finger on the most fatal consequence of the individualist

system of the past four centuries: the absolute separation for all human interests of the rich from the poor. As Disraeli pointed out nearly fifty years since, when the conscience of the country was not yet aroused to the great evil in its midst, the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, had come to form two nations, "neither knowing how the other lives." To this complete separation of the two classes must be traced much of the misery of the poor. Did the rich man know how the poor lived, would the following indictment be true? "Millions of human creatures are housed worse than the cattle and horses of many a lord and squire. Nearly a million of the London poor need re-housing; the medical authority has reported against 141,000 houses as insanitary, in which the poor are huddled together in numbers varying from four to twelve and more in a single room. What delicacy, modesty, or self-respect can be expected in men and women whose bodies are so shamelessly packed together?" And when, degraded in body and soul, the poor man is unable to earn even the small pittance on which he generally lives, he has the workhouse to receive him, where his last shred of self-respect will be taken from him. Truly, as Cardinal Vaughan said, the poor "feel dishonoured" when

they cross the doorstep of the English workhouse, wherein they are lodged almost like criminals, away from the sight of their more prosperous fellow-creatures. The wealthy made poverty dishonourable by their ostracism of the poor. But they have done more than this. By placing temptation in the way of the poor they have caused "disease, crime and pauperism to be perpetuated." The Cardinal then refers particularly to the drink traffic and its abuses, whereby the poor are constantly tempted to drink and vice. But his indictment does not end here. "By far the worst charge," he concludes, "that can be brought by the poor against the powerful classes in times past is that they robbed the people of the religion which had taught them the true view of life, provided them with strength and consolation under trials, bound up their lives with those of Jesus and His blessed Mother, and given them an assured hope beyond the grave."

Such is the situation. How is it to be met? For it must be met and remedied if some great disaster is not to befall our people. National sin ever brings its own retribution; the evil that the fathers have done must be purged away by the self-sacrifice of the children. What, then, is the remedy? Chiefly this: *Personal ser-*

vice; the giving of personal sympathy and energy to those who need it. I do not for a moment mean to say that legislation is not of any use to the very poor. Legislation is, in truth, most necessary, and it is every citizen's duty to endeavour to bring about and to support legislative action which tends to render the lot of the poor more endurable and healthier, or which will raise them in the moral or intellectual spheres, or take away from their path some of the most flagrant temptations to vice. No Christian can be indifferent as to whether the laws of the land favour the liberty-to-starve system of the ultra-individualist, or the more Catholic system which protects the weak. It is unthinkable that any responsible man can tolerate legislation which protects the tempter who, for his own gain, tempts the poor and ignorant to drink or immorality. No; our duty as Christians compels us to bring about more Christian legislation; to protect the weak against the lawless strong; to give a helping hand to the honest worker in his old age or in sickness, without degrading him to a pauper's garb, and to prevent the herding together of Christian men and women like mere cattle.

But legislation at its best can never reach the whole length of the evil. It cannot bring back the denizens of the

slums and alleys into human fellowship with their more favoured fellow-men, unless these go out to meet them. The poor have been practically outcast from all the influences that refine and educate by a selfish individualism; they must be brought back again by Christian charity. But charity does not consist in the giving of money, whether directly to individual poor or indirectly through organizations and institutions. The giving of money is but a small part of charity, and the least part of it. Christian charity is the giving of oneself. The money that is given to the poor merits the name of charity only when it is accompanied by sympathy with those to whom the money is given, and when it represents at least the desire to take the hand of the wayfarer or sufferer for comfort or encouragement. Charity indeed means fellowship, and fellowship implies personal service. Nothing can take the place of this. Money given to charitable organizations is good in its way; but if it is meant to save the giver from that personal service he owes his less-favoured neighbour, then it becomes a mischievous evil, blinding the conscience to a higher duty. Now this is just where many people are found wanting. They are willing to subscribe to any agency or institution which frees them from the pre-

sence of the poor and seems to take away the duty of giving them their personal services; they will give their money freely, even to the casual beggar, so long as they are not asked to give something more. They blind themselves to the fact that what men and women require in this life is oftentimes the hand-grasp or a sympathetic word, the moral support of human fellowship. Money can relieve bodily hunger; but there is a moral hunger, a poverty of soul, which money can never relieve. There is the strengthening of moral purpose, the brightening of the cheerless life, the comfort in the home of sorrow—these are the alms most worthy of Christian fellowship, which are most valued too by the poor, even in this commercial age. Yet they are the alms most stintedly given, perhaps because they imply a greater self-sacrifice, a more unselfish spirit. To feed the poor, as Christ would have us feed them, we must serve them with our own hands; to comfort the afflicted, we must take them to our own heart; to raise the degraded, we must give them our own comradeship. That is the charity which saves the world, and in which society has been for long so sadly wanting.

Now in this rendering of personal service who should be foremost if not they

who wear the garb of Francis of Assisi, whose first care was ever for the lepers and the outcast; who chose to make himself their friend and companion because they were the most friendless and woebegone in the whole Christian family? It was this very principle of rendering personal service to the poor and wretched which drew our blessed Father to take up his dwelling in their midst. They who were shunned by others must be succoured by him; they in whose ears no kindly voice spoke, save from a distance, must find in him a friend dwelling in their midst. One of his keenest joys was to see a friar nursing the lepers; and he left it as a heritage to his disciples that they should ever minister to the poor. Poor themselves, they were to be in a special manner the apostles of the poor and their servants. And one of the effects of the Franciscan movement in the thirteenth century was a re-enkindling of Christian charity towards the wretched and the outcast. Tertiaries and friars went into the lowest quarters of the cities, and made friends with the sinful or the destitute; or they went outside the city to the lepers' quarter, and brought comfort, physical and spiritual, to the hapless dwellers there, or they visited the prisons to reclaim the prisoners to the path of

honesty and virtue. What St Francis and his first disciples did in their day, that, it seems to me, we should do in our day. Like him, we should make ourselves, each one of us, "one among many brethren," friends of the friendless, helpers of the weak, saviours of the fallen. As has been said by one who on this subject may claim authority to speak: "We must take Christ in our hearts and go out into the highways and by-ways of the city and rescue the fallen, many of whom would never have sinned had they had a friendly hand to help them in their hour of need. That is what St Francis would have us do if he were here to-day!"* And he spoke truly: his appeal was the appeal of the seraphic Saint. Yes, were St Francis with us to-day he would, without doubt, turn his eyes towards the slums and alleys of our cities, nor would he rest till he had sent his army of Tertiaries to their relief.

Perhaps it will be asked: How are we to set to work? In what fashion can we give our services? Is it necessary for us to don uniform and march to the sound of bugle or drum; or must we form bureaus and committees for the relief of the poor?

* The Right Rev. Mgr Nugent, at the Franciscan Conference at Liverpool, 1898.

To many people the idea of personal service at once conveys the notion of ostentatious parade; yet it need not be so. Indeed the more hidden and unostentious is our service, the better is it very often. Nor is it needful in many places to form committees or establish organized agencies. Already there are agencies at work striving to cope with the great want. But these agencies are undermanned and are dragging out oftentimes but a precarious existence for want of co-operators. There is, as we have said, the Catholic Social Union, the Society of St Vincent de Paul and many similar organizations; there are the Workhouse Visiting Societies, the Prisoners' Aid Society, and others too numerous to mention, each designed to meet some special want of the day. Here are opportunities for organized personal service; but how are they supported?

Again, there is the cry of our youths—boys and girls—who leave school and are swept away almost at once in the current of the city's life. The good influences which surrounded them in their school-days are taken away from them; the priest, overworked already, is unable to keep an effective watch over their welfare; they lose their self-respect and their religion and are numbered shortly among the contented denizens of the slums, who

have neither joy here nor hope of joy hereafter. To save these boys and girls there is needed, we are often told, a lay apostolate. The laity must assist the clergy to protect the faith and morals of the young after they leave the school. Clubs, or some other agency, must be formed where they can be gathered together and be kept under good influences, where they will find that help which the young need, when they first step out into the world, to maintain their self-respect and find honest labour. Here is a form of personal service the value of which it is difficult to over-estimate, and which should be open to the laity in every mission. But we must not confine our service to the Catholic poor alone, though our own poor have the first claim upon us. Our charity must extend outside the Church and reach those who are without the Faith or even without any religion at all. We shall convert our separated brethren to the unity of the Faith more by the example of our lives and by extending to them the hand of Christian charity than by preaching at street corners, though this may be good in its way. We ought, when possible, to give our services to any work that will bring happiness and self-respect to the struggling and hapless victims of modern greed.

I have spoken of organized service for the poor. There is much that can be done only by organized service. No single individual, for example, can run a club; it needs several co-operators, and the more the better. It is the manifest duty, therefore, of those who can, to support organized service in one form or other: for so only can many of the various needs of the day be met. Not everyone, however, has leisure for organized service; and, moreover, there are needs which never come within the compass of any organization. There are thus many whose service of their poorer neighbours must needs be individual; and besides, there is a vast field of labour where individual effort alone is called for. Thus, in places where no organized service exists there is always a call for the individual worker; and even the co-operator in organized service will have many demands upon his merely individual charity if he but permits himself to take heed. Wherever one is there will always be the poor, the sick, the friendless and the weak; and wherever these are, there is need of personal service. The friendless need a friend; the poor, a helper; the sinner, a brother in Christ. Personal service, in one form or other, he owes to those who have been downridden in the world's struggle: be it individual service or organized, private or

public, everyone must do his duty to Christ's poor for Christ's sake.

And now, one more suggestion. The Tertiary Order comprises men and women of all classes in society: there are the leisured and the worker, the more educated and the less educated, rich and poor. The rich, the leisured and the educated have their manifest part to play in reclaiming the city slum; they, indeed, owe it as a reparation to God and their fellow-men to do what is in their power to remedy the evil caused in so great a measure by their class in the past. They know, many of them at least, their duty; here we need insist upon it no further.

But the salvation of the poor will never be effected merely by the more favoured classes. They can do much, but not all. The regeneration of poverty must come in great measure from the poor themselves; from those whose lives are cast in much the same conditions as the lives of those who are to be saved; from the working-men and working-women of our cities, who know what poverty is by experience, and who have felt the burden, and faced the temptations of the poor. After all men are saved by contact with the good. It is the penetrating influence of the presence of what is noble and beautiful that

raises men and fires them with the ambition of living noble and beautiful lives too. A pure-hearted girl working in a laundry has been known to bring about a reformation in the tone and character of the girls amongst whom she worked; a self-respecting, honest working-man has many a time been the apostle of the factory. The poor understand the poor; and mutual understanding is a primary condition of successful apostleship. To bring light into the dark life of the slum we need an apostolate of working-men and working-women, as well as of the leisured and rich.

And here the Tertiaries, representing both rich and poor in one fraternal bond, have an advantage. They can bring to the solution of the problem the leisure, education and wealth of the higher classes, and at the same time the knowledge, practical sympathy and living daily example of the working-class. All can give a helping hand, all can share in the apostolate. But this I do not hesitate to say, if the leisured and the wealthy can do much, the working-man and woman can do more: and if the Church is to save the "submerged tenth," she must have an army of workers gathered in great part from among the poor themselves. To our Tertiaries, then, who are of the working-class, as well as to those who have leisure and wealth, we

appeal to enrol themselves in the army of workers who are endeavouring to raise those who have fallen out of the ranks in the onward march of a selfish civilization; to bring back the outcast and uplift the fallen; above all, to prevent, as far as in us lies, the children of the poor from being carried away in the downward tide. And here again I would call your attention to the need of saving the children of those who have gone down in the battle of life.* Before they have lost all hope and ambition they must be taken in hand and shown the way to a more healthy and honourable life. We must not wait till they are drowning before we attempt to draw them from the vortex of degradation into which they have been cast by the accident of birth. Whilst they are still at school and during the first few years after they leave school, that is the time to give them the guiding hand. It is then that they must be taught the worth of an honest, hard-working life, of thrift and temperance, of religion. It is then that they must be brought into contact with men

* "It would be difficult indeed to over-rate the importance of keeping a hold on the young after they have left school. Their entire future, perhaps their salvation, will depend on the impressions made at this time. The man and the woman can be *made* when a child, but can never be remade at a later period."—*Cardinal Vaughan.*

and women—and with young men and young women who will teach them, by example as much as by word, how in their poverty they may yet acquire something of Christian "gentleness" and honest pride and self-respect; who will give them a practical manifestation of religion (that best of all preachments!) and unaffectedly grasp them by the hand and say: "Come, let us strive to win the battle of life together. We are all children of the one Father, God; we have all the same eternal home awaiting us." In such fashion only will it be possible to remedy the great evil of our time.

Thus, then, all Catholics, and in a particular measure Franciscan Tertiaries, have God's call to work in His vineyard. The condition of the age in which we live marks out our special work and the manner of working out our particular vocation. Let those who bear the name Franciscan prove themselves worthy of their seraphic founder; and let us all endeavour to be worthy disciples of our divine Saviour who came to bring peace amongst men, the peace which is found in the wisdom and charity of God.

R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1, 2 & 4, Paternoster Row, London.

X-82110

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 651 169 5